

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,sts 205R256
Reformed church review.
v.18 1914 Reformed Church Review



0 0001 00658585 3

CLASS 205

BOOK R256

VOLUME 18 4th. Ser.
61 O.S.




PENNSYLVANIA
STATE LIBRARY

*Presented by
Reverend Ellis N. Kremer.*



04-80-406-8



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

THE
REFORMED CHURCH
REVIEW.

MANAGING EDITORS:

THEO. F. HERMAN, D.D.

JOHN S. STAHR, LL.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

FREDERICK A. GAST, D.D.

RICHARD C. SCHIEDT, PH.D.

JOHN C. BOWMAN, D.D.

C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, D.D.

ANSELM V. HIESTER, A.M.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

H. M. J. KLEIN, PH.D.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

FOURTH SERIES. VOLUME XVIII.

PUBLISHED BY
THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

CONTENTS

ARTICLE

PAGE

No. 1.

I.—The Place of Christianity in Modern Japan. By J. F. STEINER	1
II.—The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. By J. M. MULLAN.	23
III.—General Synod's Year of Jubilee. By J. I. SWANDER.	36
IV.—Inaugural Address. By GEORGE LESLIE OMWAKE	51
V.—Address at the Inauguration of President Omwake. By J. G. HIBBEN	57
VI.—Beneficiary Education in the Reformed Church. II. By CLAYTON H. RANCK	63
VII.—A New Epoch. By BERNARD C. STEINER	76
VIII.—The Church's Work in the World. By HENRY GEKELER.	86
IX.—Uniformity of Public Worship. By WILLIAM H. ERB	93
X.—The Rationale of Temperance. By C. ERNEST WAGNER.	99
XI.—Contemporary Sociology. By A. V. HIESTER	107
XII.—Notices of New Books	123
<i>Szymanowski: The Evolution of a Theologian; Whiton: Getting Together; Royce: The Problem of Christianity; Reaser: Melchizedek; Haves: The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written; Smyth: Constructive Natural Theology; Appel: My Own Story; Kuhns: A One-sided Autobiography; Cole: Wheel-Chair Philosophy; McLeod: Letters to Edward.</i>	

No. 2.

I.—Creative Evolution. By R. C. SCHIEDT	133
II.—Walter Scott: Poet. By W. U. HENSEL	153
III.—Shinto the Way of the Gods. By JESSE FREDERICK STEINER.	172
IV.—Evangelism in the Reformed Church. By A. O. REITER	193
V.—Colonial Correspondence: Edited and Annotated. By JOHN BAER STOUT	206
VI.—The Ethics of the Divine Comedy. By JOHN LOVE BARNHART	219
VII.—Philip Schaff, Prophet and Pioneer of Christian Unity and the Manifestation of Unity. By RUFUS W. MILLER	234
VIII.—Notices of New Books	263
<i>Schmucker: The Meaning of Evolution; Gill and Pinchot: The Country Church; Mathews: The Making of To-morrow; Battenweiser: The Prophets of Israel; Harada: The Faith of Japan; Eucken: Can We Still Be Christians; Stanton: Telepathy of the Celestial World; Sloane: The Balkans, A Laboratory of History; Sanders: The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection; Hough: The Men of the Gospels; Miller: The Life Efficient; Oldham: India, Malaysia and the Philippines.</i>	

Rev. Ellis N. Krumm

No. 3.

I.—The World-View of Modern Theistic Philosophy. By E. E. KRESGE	273
II.—The Charm of English Prose in the Seventeenth Century. By SAMUEL McCHORD CROTHERS	321
III.—Bergson's Creative Evolution—An Estimate. By R. C. SCHIEDT	338
IV.—The Message of the Bible as Material for the Religious Education of the Japanese	353
V.—The Church and the Immigration Problem. By A. E. DAHLMANN	373
VI.—The Old and New Protestantism. By PAUL B. RUPP	388
VII.—Notices of New Books	407
<i>Hillquit and Ryan: Socialism—Promise or Menace; Penny-packer: Pennsylvania, the Keystone—a Short History; Earp: The Rural Church Movement; Stoudt: The Life and Times of Col. John Siegfried; Coddington: Plain Thoughts on Faith and Life; Youtz: The Enlarging Conception of God; Knudson: The Beacon Lights of Prophecy.</i>	

No. 4.

I.—The Present State of Theological Thought in Germany. By A. LANG	417
II.—Calvinism in Present Day Germany. By A. LANG	436
III.—Discourse on the Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism at Lancaster, May 13, 1914. By A. LANG	448
IV.—The Religious and Theological Character of the Heidelberg Catechism. By A. LANG	456
V.—The Influence of the Heidelberg Catechism on the Religions and Church Life and Piety of the People of Bern. By W. HADORN	472
VI.—“What Mean Ye by These Stones?” By JAMES I. GOOD.	482
VII.—The Pastor and the Catechumen. By C. E. CREITZ	497
VIII.—Is the Reconstruction of Christian, Specifically of Reformed Church Doctrine, a Present Possibility? By A. S. ZERBE.	507
IX.—The Necessity of Theological Reconstruction. By GEORGE W. RICHARDS	535

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY—1914.

I.

THE PLACE OF CHRISTIANITY IN MODERN JAPAN.

J. F. STEINER.

The student of Japanese history is impressed with the fact that Japan is a religious nation; that the great mass of the Japanese people for centuries has followed earnestly the Way of the Gods and the Way of the Buddhas; and that these old religions, especially Buddhism, are still vital forces which make difficult the entrance of a new religion. It must also be admitted that among the upper and educated classes, there is a strong tendency towards atheism and utter disregard of all religion. In former days this attitude of religious indifference was promoted by the influence of Confucianism which rejected all belief in the supernatural. With the introduction of western civilization came in the writings of western agnostics and sceptics who furnished the Japanese materialists with scientific grounds for their views. Armed with these intellectual weapons taken from the arsenals of western scepticism, they have set in motion an undercurrent of thought which is undermining the faith of the educated in all forms of religion.

Christianity, then, in its effort to establish itself in Japan, must lay siege to two strongholds—the old religions with their hold on the masses, and scepticism and indifference to religion championed by many of the educated and cultured. These are by no means new foes. Christianity, in the long course of its history, has met similar forces in many lands and has learned by experience how to attack them successfully. Nevertheless, when they are securely entrenched in the hearts of a superior people, who possess a good civilization and who believe themselves supplied with all that is necessary for greatness or success, they are foes worthy of our best efforts. It is not strange then that Christianity is having a hard struggle to make a place for itself among the Japanese people. But that it is succeeding no student of the situation can doubt. And in this paper it is our purpose to make plain if possible the victories already won and the battles yet to be fought so that we may more clearly understand what Christianity is doing in this Island Empire beyond the sea.

In 1859 when the first Protestant missionaries reached Japan, they found that they were not to work entirely in virgin soil. The name of Christ had preceded them and was known from one end of the empire to the other. In the sixteenth century, Roman Catholic missionaries from Spain and Portugal had come to Japan and preached so successfully that in less than a hundred years their converts numbered over a million. The time seemed ripe for the Christianization of Japan, but these Jesuit missionaries were suspected by the Japanese government of political designs and were banished from the country. In 1638 the following edict was sent forth: "So long as the sun shall continue to warm the earth let no Christian be so bold as to come to Japan; and let all know that the king of Spain himself, or the Christian's God, or the great God of all, if he dare violate this command, shall pay for it with his head."¹ An era of terrible persecution set in, so unrelenting and far-reaching that the native Christians were practically

¹ Clement, *Christianity in Modern Japan*, p. 3.

exterminated. Notice boards prohibiting Christianity were then set up along every road and systematic efforts were made to prevent this religion from ever taking root again. For over two hundred years the words "Yasu" (Jesus) and "Kurishitan" (Christian) were spoken only in contempt and were symbols of all that is low and despised.

The early Protestant missionaries, therefore, faced this handicap of an evil tradition which made them objects of suspicion and hatred whenever they uttered the name of Christ. It is no wonder then that during the first ten years of their service, they won only six converts. It took rare courage indeed in those days for a Japanese to bear the name of Christ, for it meant imprisonment, persecution, and sometimes death. It was not until 1873 that the edicts against Christianity were removed by order of the government, and the principle of religious liberty promulgated. Up to the year 1872 there were only about a dozen Christian converts and not a single Christian church in the empire. In the year 1889 there were 274 churches with a membership of 29,000.

This remarkable growth of the Christian church during this period of 18 years can be explained in several ways. The nation had come forth from its period of seclusion and was eager to take up with everything that was new and strange. There was a craze for things western, so strong for a time that it threatened to sweep away the old institutions. The young men of ambition and promise had a great desire to learn English, and as the missionaries were almost the only available teachers, many were brought under their influence and were converted. Then during the eighties there was a series of revivals in various parts of the empire in which God's power was made manifest in remarkable conversions, in interest in Bible study, and in evangelistic zeal. All forms of Christian work made such great progress that many freely predicted that missionaries could soon be withdrawn because Japan would rapidly become a Christian nation.

But about 1890 the inevitable reaction came. The Japanese

pride in their own institutions reasserted itself and things western were no longer so popular. As the Japanese grew in power and influence, their national consciousness deepened, and they determined to carve out their own destiny and not follow blindly western custom and leadership. Then increasing numbers of Japanese travelled abroad and studied our civilization at first hand and became familiar with our weaknesses as well as with our strength. They saw the failure of Christianity to solve our social problems and regenerate our society and so were led to doubt the advisability of accepting this religion which in many respects seemed to them to be a failure. The strong national spirit which led many to place the Emperor higher than even the Christian's God kept many aloof from Christianity, for they believed that patriotism and this new religion were incompatible. Through translations of western books and by means of better knowledge of the English language, new avenues of western thought, many of which were frankly irreligious, were opened up to thousands of Japanese students and educated men. All these influences produced a reaction against Christianity and ushered in a dark decade during which time the infant church had a hard struggle to hold its own. Spiritual life declined, many lost their evangelistic zeal, and hundreds of Christians slipped back into the world and were lost to the cause.

Since 1900 the pendulum has seemed to be swinging once more in the direction of renewed hope and greater activities. The Japanese church and the missionary body have more fully awakened to a knowledge of the greatness of their task, and are laying plans for better and wider work. However no revival like that in the eighties has blessed these opening years of the twentieth century. In spite of an increased missionary force, a better educated Japanese ministry, more fully equipped mission schools, and larger experience in missionary work, the progress has been slow. In fact during the last few years the number of baptisms has been decreasing. According to the *Christian Movement in Japan* for the years 1908-1913, the

total number of adult baptisms in the Protestant churches was as follows:² 1908, 8,623; 1909, 7,449; 1910, 6,305; 1911, 7,919; 1912, 6,365; 1913, 6,089. The full significance of these figures can best be seen by calling to mind the Protestant Christian forces now at work in Japan. These may be enumerated as follows: 962 missionaries (including wives); 1,354 native evangelists and assistants; 431 Bible women; 18 boys' and 59 girls' boarding schools and 141 day schools with a total of about 18,000 pupils and students, the teaching force of which is predominantly Christian; many Christian orphanages, schools for the blind, hospitals and dispensaries, leper asylums, homes for ex-convicts, rescue homes, and other charitable agencies which must exert a large Christian influence; Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. work carried on in most of the larger cities; Christian periodicals and books sold all over the empire; and thousands of Christian laymen who in Sunday schools and in their homes and places of work are living and teaching the Christian life. Quite a substantial Christian army it appears to us, until we remember that it is scattered among fifty millions of people. However that such a well-equipped and aggressive force is able to bring as its direct results only six or seven thousand converts a year gives us some inkling of the strength of the opposition it faces. Of course statistical tables can never tabulate spiritual forces, and we know that there are indirect results of this Christian ministry which can not be adequately measured. Foundations are being laid, influences for righteousness are being started, the full results of which will not be known for many years. The policy of the nation is more and more being guided by Christian ideals, and increasing thousands each year are trying in a measure at least to live according to Christian principles. Nevertheless, that the number of converts is relatively so small, with no substantial increase each year, is a fact worthy of serious consideration. It by no

² The figures refer in each case to the preceding statistical year. It ought to be stated that during this five-year period the total number of communicants or full members increased from 57,830 to 73,226.

means indicates that Christianity is suffering defeat in its effort to win the Japanese people. On the contrary, in innumerable ways, it is more strongly entrenching itself in the very life of the nation. It simply reveals to us the fact that we Christians who have expected the rapid Christianization of Japan have failed to give due weight to the hindrances that stand in the way. Let us then for a moment examine some of these obstacles to Christian progress so that we can better understand the problem that awaits our solution.

The first obstacle is one that exists wherever Christian work is undertaken, the fact that Christendom is not really Christian. This hindrance gains special importance in the case of Japan, because the Japanese are such wide awake people, who travel widely and investigate thoroughly for themselves the claims of the Christian religion. Their country is on the other side of the globe and their language is far different from ours, but they know as well as we the facts of our history and the conditions of present society. Our scandals, our notorious divorce cases, our murders and daring robberies, our graft and political corruption are telegraphed to their daily papers and are read everywhere. They have studied our church history and are familiar with the controversies, persecutions, and heresies that darken its pages. They know the bitter hostility that exists between the Roman Catholics and Protestants, as well as their wide divergence in faith and worship. They see the unessential differences in creed which make rivals of different Protestant denominations, and then come to the conclusion that Christians are as bigoted and narrow as the Buddhists. The missionary brings to them the message of the brotherhood of men, extends to them the hand of fellowship, and forgets that they are members of a different race. But when the Japanese picks up his morning paper, he realizes that this message of the missionary is still a mere ideal unattained by any Christian nation. When he attempts to deal with us commercially, he finds a tariff wall confronting him with its reminder that he is an outsider who must pay if he wishes to

enjoy the benefits of American trade. Should he desire to come and cast his lot with us, his ideas of universal brotherhood are again shattered, for he finds the doors closed in his face. When he attempts to take his place in the world as our equal, the voice of race prejudice is lifted in fierce protest, and he is asked to remember that he is of Mongolian blood, a member of an inferior race. Whatever may be the right solution of the race and immigration problem, this is the way it appeals to the average Japanese. Judged from his viewpoint, the American attitude is unchristian, and this fact weighs more heavily with him than any assertion the missionary may make. The missionary may go to a foreign people and preach Christianity in its purity, but their estimate of its value will not be based on his words alone, but will be determined largely by its fruits in the land from which the missionary came. All this reveals not only the difficulties of missionary work, but the reflex value of missions in compelling us to accomplish better results in the homeland and make of America a righteous nation, a worthy example to all people.

Turning now to the hindrances within Japan itself, we find several that stand out with special prominence. One of the most important is the supposed conflict between the national spirit and Christianity. The Japanese in their deep ambition to make of themselves a great nation, continually look upon religion from the political point of view. "Will Christianity help their nation?" is the all-important question. Among those who have answered this question in the negative is Baron Kato, formerly president of the Imperial University in Tokyo. In his mind the Christian doctrine of universal brotherhood is dangerous to the welfare of the state. He would reject Christianity because it is treasonable to honor God more than the Emperor, "We Japanese," he says, "know of no being who is higher than the Emperor."³ In 1897 when an effort was made to revive Shinto, its advocates asked Japanese Christians the

³ Quoted by Faust, *Christianity as a Social Factor in Modern Japan*, p. 85.

following questions: “(1) Can the worship of his sacred Majesty, the Emperor, which every loyal Japanese performs, be reconciled with the worship of God and Christ by Christians? (2) Can the existence of authorities that are quite independent of the Japanese state, such as that of God, Christ, the Bible, the pope, the head of the Greek church, be regarded as harmless? (3) Can the Japanese who is the faithful servant of Christ be regarded at the same time as the faithful servant of the Emperor and a true friend of his Majesty’s faithful subjects? Or to put it in another way, Is our Emperor to follow in the wake of western emperors and to pray ‘Son of God, have mercy on me?’⁴ In the Japanese schools, as is well known, a portrait of the Emperor is set up and worshipped by the students on special national holidays. When the imperial rescript on education is read, the students listen with more reverence than do Christians to the reading of their Scriptures. In case of a fire in a public school, every Japanese thinks it his first duty to rescue the portrait of the Emperor even at the risk of his life. This devotion to the Emperor is cultivated to such an extent that many conscientious Japanese feel that by unreserved allegiance to Christ they are untrue to the welfare of their country. The ill-advised effort of the government to build up patriotism on the insecure foundations of Shinto and the theory of the Emperor’s divine descent is largely responsible for this opposition to Christianity. Japanese Christian writers have from time to time ably answered these objections of the extreme nationalists, but they still remain deeply rooted in the minds of many of the people.

Another hindrance to the spread of the gospel is an intellectual one which arises partly from the philosophies found in their old religions and partly from the inrush of western sceptical thought. Buddhism is essentially pantheistic, and therefore a people grounded in its philosophy find it hard to rise to the Christian conception of a personal God, or of a God who is the creator and ruler of the universe. Then the philosophy

⁴ Cary, *Japan and Its Regeneration*, p. 97.

of Confucianism is at bottom agnostic. It turns away from the spiritual and supernatural, and emphasizes only man's duties in the ordinary relations of life. The inconsistencies and superstitions of these old religions have not only prevented the educated from taking them seriously, but have caused them to regard all religion as useless. When scientific materialism came from the west to Japan, it found many minds prepared to give it a hearty welcome. The Imperial University at Tokyo became the headquarters of materialistic agnosticism, and to-day it advocates its views so insistently that it is hard for a Christian student to go through his course there and come out with his faith unshaken. Christianity is regarded as a superstition much out of date, on which a progressive nation like Japan ought not to waste time. Education, or education and morals should be the sole guide for men. It has been the dream of many Japanese to show to the world how a great system of moral education could be built up entirely apart from religion. In the words of Professor Okakura: "We do not see any convincing reason why morals should be based upon the teaching of a special denomination in face of the fact that we can be upright and brave without the help of a creed with a god or deities at the other end." The late Prince Ito voiced the sentiment of many of his class in these words: "I regard religion itself as quite unnecessary for a nation's life. Science is far above superstition; and what is religion, Buddhism or Christianity, but superstition, and therefore a source of weakness to a nation? I do not regret the tendency to free thought and atheism which is almost universal in Japan, because I do not regard it as a source of danger to the community."⁵

Still another hindrance is the moral one, found not only in Japan, but the world over. In Japan, Christianity's insistence upon a pure and upright life has been a special obstacle to its acceptance largely because Buddhism and Shinto make few moral demands on their adherents. In both of these religions, an immoral life does not necessarily affect their stand-

⁵ *Japan Weekly Mail*, October 5, 1907.

ing as good religionists. The Shin sect of Buddhism makes no pretence of saving a man from his sins. It looks upon sin as too fundamental a fact of man's nature to be uprooted. He must be saved in his sins. Therefore we are not surprised to learn that a former Lord Abbot of this sect in Kyoto lived for years an openly licentious life without being criticized by his followers. It explains why the rank and file of the priests can be corrupt and rotten and never fear being degraded from their sacred office. The moral demands which Buddhism makes upon the people are very slight even in the sects of the Holy Path. When Christianity comes, then, with its demand for a life above reproach, many shrink from taking its vows. They admire the beauty of its teachings, but are not prepared to make the moral adjustment required of them.

Even Japan's best friends admit that there exists in Japan a great moral callousness in regard to the evil of sexual irregularities. In higher society, concubinage is still carried on, although in violation of the law. The lower classes who are deterred from this course by the expense, frequent houses of prostitution. The social evil being licensed by the government is not regarded as a shame or disgrace. Immorality, like an insidious disease, has spread itself all through the different strata of Japanese society, and very little protest is heard except from Christian sources. We in America must bow our heads in shame when we preach morality to the Japanese, for our cities sometimes seem to be rotten to the very core. But at least the deep sinfulness of this evil is ingrained in the hearts of all except the most degraded, and a strong public opinion exists which keeps vice from flaunting itself in public places. Christianity can make no compromise with this sin, and this fact prevents many Japanese from openly espousing its principles.

The above are only a few of the many hindrances that might be mentioned, but they are sufficient to give an idea of the difficult fight which Christianity is waging in this Island Empire. We must not labor under the delusion that the Jap-

Japanese realize their need of Christianity. They, as a nation, do not feel that they are in spiritual darkness. Somehow the idea has gotten abroad that the Japanese are eagerly waiting to be taught the truth, and that if only more workers were sent the harvest could soon be gathered. It is doubtless true that many are now in a receptive mood and would listen to the Christian message gladly, but the days of the harvest are not yet at hand. Many more workers are needed, but their work must first be the sowing of the seed which may not bring forth its fruit for many years. In our eagerness for results we sometimes forget all that is involved in the Christianization of a country like Japan. It means the overthrow of old traditions deeply rooted in the consciousness of the people and preserved in their most attractive forms in their classic literature. It means a new viewpoint in their philosophy, an elevation of their moral life, and an adjustment to ideas that are foreign to their minds. Such a revolution as this which affects not only external forms but the very heart of the nation, can not be expected to take place in a day, nor even in a century. It took Buddhism almost six centuries to entrench itself strongly among the Japanese. We must remember that Christianity has been at work in Japan only 54 years. It has been only 40 years since the edicts against Christianity have been removed and freedom of religious worship allowed. It has been less time than this that missionaries have been sent in sufficient numbers to do really aggressive work. Men now living can remember when it was a crime punishable with death to print or even possess a copy of the Christian Scriptures. And yet in spite of all these hindrances and shortness of time, Christianity has won already an important place for itself in Japan.

When we wish to estimate the real significance of the Christian movement in Japan, we must look not at the numbers but at the character and standing of the Christian converts. The 190,000⁶ Christians could very easily be swallowed up among

⁶ This figure includes Greek and Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. The latter number 90,000.

the 50 millions of people if they belonged to the lower classes entirely. But Christianity's greatest successes have been won among the Samurai, the former knights of Japan, who now form a large proportion of the leading men of the nation. Thus we can see how the Japanese church has an influence out of all proportion to its numbers. A few years ago the president of the lower house of the Imperial Diet was an elder in a Tokyo church. One of the most eloquent and popular speakers in the Diet is a Christian whose voice is frequently heard in religious meetings throughout the country. The editor of the *Kahoku Shimpō*, the largest daily newspaper in Sendai and in northern Japan, is a member of the Methodist church and is active in Christian work. Dr. Nitobe, the well-known Christian writer and lecturer, is president of the First Higher Government school in Tokyo and has great influence in Japanese educational circles. One of the most popular novelists in Japan is a Christian. The only Japanese university for women has a Christian founder and president. And so the list might go on until we had mentioned leading men in almost every profession, who in their enlarged spheres of influence are bearing witness to the power of Christ.

The strength of the organized Christian church in Japan must not be underestimated. The Christian chapels hidden away on side streets, often not churchly in their external appearance, usually fail to catch the eye of the transient tourist who is impressed only with the magnificent Buddhist temples which are strategically located in almost every place of vantage. What the tourist does not take time to investigate is the kind of people who frequent these different places of worship. They forget that these temples are relics of a glorious past, whereas the Christian chapels are the result of aggressive efforts of living men. Dr. Murakami, a famous Buddhist priest, at a gathering of Buddhists a few years ago spoke as follows: "You may be proud of the thousands of Buddhist temples here in Tokyo, but what are they? They are the temples where dead men gather. There is not a single temple

where really living men come to listen to the teaching of Buddha and to cultivate their mind. When I see that Christianity owns everywhere in Tokyo large church edifices for men of action to come to, I feel so ashamed that I know not what to do."

And in our estimate of the influence of the organized church in Japan, we must not fail to mention some of its consecrated ministers and educators whose names are known beyond the borders of their land. Among those who stand out most prominently are: Dr. Harada, president of Doshisha University, a man who in Christian scholarship and in executive ability stands second to none in his country; Dr. Ibuka, president of Meiji Gakuin, the Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed school in Tokyo; the late Bishop Honda of the Methodist church, a man who in deep piety and in successful leadership was an inspiration to all who worked with him; Pastors Uemura and Miyagawa, who stand out in the first rank as influential pulpit orators; the leaders in North Japan College in Sendai, Drs. Sasao and Demura, and Professor Kajiwara, who enjoy more than local fame. Under such leadership the organized church has early developed a spirit of independence and a desire to carry on all the work that is usually done by an aggressive church. The larger denominational groups of native Christians are organized independently of missionary control and are entirely self-governing. They have their home and foreign mission boards, their missionaries being supported by contributions from the different churches. The native church already, although small in numbers and weak financially, is making an effort to stand alone, and no longer deserves the reproach of being called an alien institution. This fact makes the Christian movement in Japan very significant and gives good hope for great development in the future.

But Christian influence in Japan is not limited to the work of the organized church. Those who understand the laws of social development know that in the growth of a religion its ethical standards and material benefits far outstrip acceptance

of its dogmas and ecclesiastical functions. The opposite might have been the case in Japan if the government had adopted the Christian religion bodily, but fortunately the infant church escaped this danger and the development has proceeded along natural lines. In trying then to give an estimate of the place of Christianity in Japan, we must look beyond the borders of the church and see the influence it has exerted on the government, literature, moral standards, and philanthropic and social work. Mr. Kanzo Uchimura, a prominent Japanese Christian who has remained aloof from the church, wrote a few years ago as follows: "There is such a thing as Christianity outside the churches, and it is taking hold of the Japanese people far more strongly than the missionaries imagine. The western idea that a religion must show itself in an organized form before it can be recognized as a religion at all, is alien to the Japanese mind. With us religion is more a family affair than national or social, as is shown by the strong hold Confucianism has had upon us without showing itself in any organized societies and movements. And I am confident that Christianity is now slowly but steadily taking the place of Confucianism as the family religion of the Japanese. Indeed I can cite a number of cases where Christianity has been adopted in this form by my countrymen. As far as I can see, Christianity is making progress in this country far ahead of missionaries. This new form of Christianity adopted by my countrymen is neither orthodox nor Unitarian. We go to Jesus of Nazareth directly and aim to live and be made like him. And I am confident in making this statement, I voice a sentiment of many both known and unknown to me, who are disciples of Christ without having any connection with so-called churches."⁷ Another eminent Japanese made the statement that at least a million Japanese outside the churches are directing their lives by the teaching of Christ.⁸ While these statements may be unduly exaggerated,

⁷ Brown, *Report on a Second Visit to China, Japan and Korea in 1909*, p. 25.

⁸ *The East and West*, January, 1910.

yet it is doubtless true that Christianity has been a real molding force in the lives of many who have been opposed to it as a religious organization.

The great statesmen, who after the Restoration in 1868 bore the largest part of the burden of building up Japan as a world power, were much influenced by Christianity. Some of them were pupils of missionaries and while young had their minds filled with Christian ideals. Others travelled abroad and with true insight saw the value of Christian institutions and determined to mold their government along similar lines. Verbeck, one of the greatest missionaries of modern times, was made a government adviser and became the first head of the Imperial University. The late Prince Ito, although anti-Christian, gave this testimony: "Japan's progress and development are largely due to the influence of missionaries exerted when Japan was first studying the outer world." The influence of Christian nations can be seen in the national constitution promulgated in 1889. The religious liberty which Japan enjoys is due as a Japanese has said "to the unconscious influence of the Christian church in Japan." In 1876 Sunday was made the official day of rest and is now observed by all government offices, schools, banks, etc., although as yet merchants, farmers, and laboring people follow old traditions and either work every day in the week or observe occasional rest days as local custom dictates. Sunday is becoming more and more widely recognized not only as a day of rest, but as a day of worship, the Buddhists also having adopted Sunday as their day for preaching and special religious services.

Christianity is also putting its stamp on the literature of the nation. Under the influence of western ideas, the style and content of literary expression have been greatly changed, and in this transformation Christianity has played no small part. At present 74 weekly and monthly magazines are published by different Christian organizations and agencies. Not many years ago no bookseller would handle the Christian Scriptures, but now the Bible and standard Christian books can be

found at almost any reputable bookstore in the larger cities. During 1912 the Bible societies working in Japan report that over 373,000 Bibles, testaments, and portions of Scriptures were distributed through the empire. The contents of the Bible are becoming more widely known each year. Quite frequently passages from the Bible are found in secular books and magazines. Lives of Christ and Paul, commentaries on the Bible, translations of foreign theological works, etc., are almost without number. At present there is a popular demand for books on the conduct of life, culture, personality, and self respect, which are filled with Christian sentiments although the writers are often non-Christians. At least three of the popular daily newspapers have Christian editors and they are doing much to elevate the tone of the daily press. The modern novel has been affected by Christianity. Its language and ideals have been elevated, and the novelists have learned to distinguish between sin and crime, a distinction not formerly made. "That people in general," said Dr. Nitobe, "believe that Christianity is the best former of character is evident by the fact that so many of the characters in popular novels and dramas are Christian."⁹ The rapid changes and unrest characteristic of this period of transition are not favorable to the production of a classic literature, but when Japan does produce a writer of the first magnitude, he will find it necessary to incorporate into his writings a world of Christian ideas which are now molding the lives of the people.

The influence of Christianity is especially seen in the elevation of Japan's moral standards. The undermining of old established customs which has been a necessary result of taking on a new civilization has brought about a condition of moral chaos that is very deplorable. The adjustment to the new order has been hard to make. Old standards have lost their power of appeal. In this crisis Christianity has been the only rock that has remained unshaken. Even many of those who reject its religious claims, recognize the purity of its eth-

⁹ Faust, *Christianity as a Social Factor in Modern Japan*, p. 44, note 2.

ical standards and see the wisdom of following its teachings. Through the influence of Christianity, concubinage has been made illegal. The late emperor will probably be the last ruler of Japan to have concubines. At the present emperor's marriage mutual pledges were made, and it is the testimony of all that the emperor is true to his marriage vows.

Even the social evil, one of the curses of Japan, has felt the influence of Christianity. Through the direct efforts of missionaries, the old law was so modified in 1900 that a girl can no longer be kept in a brothel against her will. In two years after this act of free cessation had been passed, it is estimated that 12,000 girls left these dens of shame and returned to their homes.

The cultivation of morality among the Japanese youth of both sexes has become a serious question. Leading educators have confessed their failure to secure good results in the teaching of morals. Debauchery and dissipation ruin the lives of many of the students. In the midst of this transition period they are like a ship without a rudder driven along by their own stormy passions. In their efforts to turn back the tide of immorality, educators have been inclined to introduce more Christian ideals in their system of moral training. In many government schools, missionaries and Japanese Christians are allowed to give the students instruction along lines of Christian morality. The Department of Education in a number of ways gives evidence of being hostile to Christianity, but it is interesting to note how more and more the whole school system is becoming leavened by Christian thought and ideals.

In Japanese Buddhism and in Shinto we find no trace of the Christian principle of charity. Japan had its poor, but the head of the family was responsible for all its members, and the head of the village for all those who came under his rule. Through the strict application of this theory, pauperism was largely prevented, but we find little indication that they recognized any obligation to help those outside their immediate circle or community. This broad feeling of charity for all

who are in distress regardless of creed or nationality was brought in by Christianity. One of the first and foremost examples of this was the contribution of \$240,000 sent by Japan to the earthquake sufferers in San Francisco a few years ago. This new idea of charity has expressed itself in a relief fund established by the government for use in emergencies. Japan is notorious for its floods and typhoons which leave thousands in distress each year. Much of this suffering is now relieved by the prompt action of the government in investigating cases of need and disbursing the necessary relief.

Formerly the Japanese government as well as the old religions paid no attention to the needs of the defective and unfortunate classes. Lepers were allowed to mingle with other people, and the insane and the blind received no special care. Contact with Christianity is changing all this. Not only are there Christian institutions to care for these needy people, but government institutions are being established for the education of the blind, for the segregation of lepers, for the treatment of the indigent sick, and for the care of homeless children. This new movement in Japan for the welfare of classes hitherto neglected owes its inspiration as well as its leadership almost entirely to Christianity. Indeed this practical application of Christian principles for the betterment of society is probably doing more than anything else for the removal of prejudice against the Christian religion, and may prove to be the entering wedge that will ultimately open the hearts of all to its teachings.

The peace movement in Japan is another extra-ecclesiastical result of Christian influence. Largely through the efforts of those financially interested in securing large military appropriations, aided by the sensational press, a feeling has gone abroad that Japan is a warlike nation ready to fight on slight provocation. Nothing could be farther from the truth, for Japan knows by bitter experience the awful cost of war and its deadening effect on her industrial and commercial development. Those whose opinions are based on rash statements of

the jingo press of both countries should read the report of the peace movement in Japan for the year 1912 and see what a vigorous campaign is being carried on. The Japan Peace Society has within recent years spread all over the country, carrying with it enthusiasm for the cause of peace. On its roll of officers and members are found the names of men who stand high in the councils of the nation. No one can question the sincerity of their motives. Through the leadership of Christian forces, they have caught a vision of the blessings of peace, and are joining hands with the west in this important work of the twentieth century.

If space permitted, we might also tell of the work of the Red Cross society, temperance movement, prison reform, societies to aid discharged prisoners, and similar movements, which often have little or no connection with Christian organizations, but which are products of the Christian movement in Japan. They indicate how Japan's viewpoint is changing, thus forcing into the background her old philosophy of life. The individual is more and more coming into his own, his worth is being recognized, and the nation is realizing its duty of working for his welfare.

This rapid review of the power of Christianity in Japan and of the movements for social righteousness which it has set in motion ought to fill our hearts with profound gratitude, for this is no ordinary work that God has wrought during the last half century. When we compare the Japanese nation of 1860 with the Japanese nation of today, we are astounded at the marvelous transformation that has taken place. But we must remember that God's vision extends into the future and that before his all-seeing eye there stands out the Japanese nation that is to be when righteousness shall reign supreme. We dare not stop now deterred by difficulties, nor can we allow ourselves to be satisfied because of what is already done. As yet only a beginning has been made in the Christianization of Japan. The strategic centers have been occupied, educational

institutions have been established, influential leaders have been won, and many Christian forces started, but even now there are millions in Japan untouched by Christian love. The committee on the distribution of forces appointed by the Conference of Federated Missions, after a careful survey of the field, recently gave the following report: "Approximately 80 per cent. of the total population, or above forty millions, reside in rural districts, of which number so far as our data indicate 96 per cent. constitute an entirely unworked field. Of the remaining 20 per cent. of the total population residing in cities and towns, about one fifth is still unprovided for; thus giving us the result that above 80 per cent. of the population of Japan are not being directly reached by the evangelistic forces. Even in the cities and towns which are occupied, a comparatively small portion of the people have been in any real sense evangelized. A gigantic and yet most inspiring task, therefore, still lies before us in the Christianization of Japan which calls first of all for renewed humiliation, deeper consecration, and a larger life."¹⁰

The question at once arises: Is the present organized church in Japan equal to such a task? Has Christianity made such a secure place for itself that it can with reasonable rapidity win the allegiance of the whole nation? That Christianity has already taken such deep root in Japan that it will always remain there a great religious power would be conceded by all. But to believe that unaided by the Christian forces of other lands it could make much headway against all the opposition it faces, would be beyond the faith of the most optimistic. There are only 186 Protestant self-supporting churches and 559 that are partly selfsupporting. How could such a few churches finance an aggressive evangelistic movement and support the Christian schools needed for the training of leaders? Outside help is absolutely necessary if the Christianization of Japan is to go on even at the present slow rate of progress. And if Christian America is really going to make a determined

¹⁰ *Christian Movement in Japan*, 1913, p. 284.

effort to win Japan for Christ, the force of evangelistic missionaries ought to be doubled. This would mean one missionary for 60,000 people which could hardly be criticized on the score of overcrowding.

Men trained for leadership in social service should be sent out, for here is a field of opportunity that will produce great results. Industrial Japan is now in the throes of a transition period. The factory system is fast being adopted and with it is coming in the long train of evils with which we are so familiar in our own country. Let Christian workers familiar with these problems step in and show the Japanese nation how the spirit of Christ can heal the suffering, protect the weak, remove injustice, and give to all a fair chance to live a wholesome life. The power of appeal of such work can not be overestimated. In our missionary work we must not forget to follow the example of our Lord, who in the midst of his important work of preaching gave most of his time and strength to deeds of mercy and helpful service.

But one of the greatest needs is for Japanese leaders of ability, men of thorough education, who possess the Christian world view, and who are filled with Christian ideals. If Christian preachers and writers are to dominate the thought-life of their nation, they must be as well educated as men in other professions. Under the present system of Christian education in Japan this is not possible. The Christian schools are not equipped to give men the equal of university training. What is needed is a Christian university to be the capstone to the whole Christian movement. Such a university would attract men of the highest caliber and ability, and would give a prestige and standing to Christianity that it does not possess among the Japanese today. If we will make possible for our Japanese fellow Christians the training of their leaders in a high grade Christian university, which in its emphasis on the intellect will not forget the needs of the spirit, we will be making one of the most notable contributions to the cause of Christ in the Far East.

The present place of Christianity in Japan has been won in spite of many obstacles at the cost of much suffering and self-sacrifice. What its future place will be depends largely on our faith and largeness of vision and willingness to coöperate in this important work.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
CHICAGO, ILL.

II.

THE PROLOGUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.¹

J. M. MULLAN.

Introduction.

It seems good to the writer at the beginning of this discussion to state briefly the nature of the Fourth Gospel, according to the view with which he is in agreement. That is to say, it is a transition gospel, the occasion for its writing having been the transplanting of Christianity from Jewish to Gentile soil. It is a work of the second century and consequently was not written by the Apostle John, but its authorship is unknown. What is of more importance still, it is not history or biography and was not intended to supplement the other gospels in this respect. It is historical and biographical in form, and, moreover, is based upon the historical data contained in the synoptics, while at the same time it contains historical material not found in them, yet it is not a fourth edition of the memoirs of Jesus. Ideas, not events, are the materials of which it is composed, which, as colors on the palette of a painter, the Evangelist used to produce a masterpiece of the Christ. It is not a photograph, so to speak, of Jesus as he lived among men that the Fourth Gospel presents, but a portrait of the Christ, grand and sublime, as he lived in the consciousness of the church after a century's experience of his spiritual presence and

¹ Books consulted in the preparation of this article: Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*; Humplines, *St. John and Other New Testament Teachers*; Johnstone, *The Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel*; McGiffert, *Eusebius*; Plummer, *St. John in Cambridge Bible*; Rigg, *The Messages of Jesus*; Scott, *Apologetic of the New Testament*, and *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology*; Worley, *The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists*.

power. If we consider that the first three gospels deal chiefly with the Christ of history we may consider that the fourth gospel deals chiefly with the Christ of experience, and instead of merely adding events to those already given, it presents "a larger, more spiritual portrait of the world's Saviour."

This is not a modern view, strictly speaking. Clement of Alexandria (150–220 A. D.) stated it seventeen centuries ago when he declared that the author of this gospel, being urged by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a "Spiritual Gospel," and that it was not his purpose to set forth the "external facts" (bodily or literal elements), which, he said, had already been made plain, referring to the first three gospels. The antithesis of "spiritual" versus "bodily" meant, in the Alexandrian school, "figurative" or "allegorical" versus "literal." Johannine criticism seems to confirm this ancient claim. The Fourth Gospel is not, then, primarily history or biography, but rather symbolism, and represents the culmination of a process of idealization which began with Paul who desired to know Christ not after the flesh but after the spirit—a spiritualizing of the history and career of Jesus, an interpretation of his life and person *sub specie aeternitatis*.

THE PROLOGUE.

By this familiar term is designated the first eighteen verses of the first chapter of the Gospel. Chrysostom characterized it as "The Golden Proem." As the term *prologue* indicates this passage is an introduction to the Gospel. There are those who deny this, notably Harnack, who has declared that the Prologue is not a key but an enigma, and is more difficult to understand than the Gospel itself which it presumes to introduce. However, the weight of criticism is in support of the position that it is an organic part of the Gospel and constitutes an important preface. As such it contains the philosophical groundwork, the metaphysical basis, of the Gospel. It supplies the background against which we are enabled to view the life of Jesus in the Evangelist's perspective. It

contains preëminently, the philosophical conception according to which the portraiture of Christ is drawn, and the value of Jesus is appraised. Thus we may assume, as it has been expressed, that what is implicit in the Gospel is explicit in the Prologue.

It is a passage universally recognized as difficult to analyze. This is due to a peculiarity of structure which has been spoken of as its "spiral movement." "An idea comes to the front like the strand of a rope, retires again, and then reappears later on for development and definition. Meanwhile another idea, like another strand, comes before us and retires to reappear in like manner." This peculiarity has also been referred to as the incoming and receding of successive waves of thought.

Without attempting a detailed exegesis of the passage, a summary of its leading ideas might be made as follows:

At the beginning there existed the Logos, eternal, personal, divine. He was the medium of God's activity in the creation of the world. Through him all things were made, including matter itself. Moreover the Logos was the animating principle of the world. "That which began in him was life itself." In man this principle of life became the inner light. "That life was the light of mankind." That light shone from the beginning in the midst of the darkness of animalism, ignorance and perversion, but those obstructions were not able to extinguish the light. It enlightens every man on his coming into the world, with varying degrees of illumination. From time to time there appeared men in whom the light shone with exceptional brilliancy. Such a man was John the Baptist, who recognized the light and whence it came. The world, however, neither recognized the light nor whence it came, save a comparatively few who received the light as from God and were given the right to become sons of God. Yet in the course of the ages the Logos-light shone more brightly until it burst forth with the undimmed splendor of the sun in the person of Jesus Christ. "The Logos became flesh." The process

of creation flowered. In Jesus Christ the power of creation, the life of the world, the light of mankind, was seen to be the Father full of mercy and truth.

Commentators differ in their divisions of the Prologue but all agree in finding it to contain three leading conceptions which shall constitute the basis of the further discussion of this passage. They are: (1) The Logos; (2) The Incarnation; (3) The Revelation of God.

1. THE LOGOS.

The purpose of this discussion does not require a consideration of the Logos philosophies with which the readers of the REVIEW are familiar. It is less ambitious and more personal. The discussion is an interpretation based upon the writer's personal experience.

The writer wishes to make grateful acknowledgment of the service that historical criticism has rendered him with respect to the Fourth Gospel, which, in consequence, has become to him again, after a lapse, a living book. It has come to the writer with the joy of a new-found hope that the use of the Logos idea in the Fourth Gospel is an *ad hominem* use of a term of speculative philosophy, current in the days when this Gospel was written, among a people to whom it connoted something definite in the realm of their thought-world. The term *logos* was one, that, we would say, was in the air, and might have been heard in discussions of men on the street. It expressed a vital conception. In this respect it has aptly been compared to the term *evolution* in our own day. It came to the writer of the Fourth Gospel as an inspiration to use this word *Logos* as a medium of expression—a happy as well as a convenient formula to describe but not to determine the contents of the Gospel, serving to fill a deeply felt need in the religious vocabulary of the times. It was a difficult matter, as it has been on every foreign missionary field, to convey Christianity to the Gentiles, because of the absence of a common religious language. The Evangelist, in utilizing this term to interpret

Jesus to the Greeks, did comparably what was done by the first interpreters of Jesus to the Jews when they used the term *Messiah*. Indeed it should be said that Greek philosophy performs a function in the Fourth Gospel similar to that rendered by Jewish Messianism in the other three.

Just what service this term rendered may be readily seen. The people for whom this Gospel was written conceived of God as a transcendent being, who had no essential and vital relation to the world, such as is familiar to us who think of God as immanent. There was a great gulf fixed between the finite and the infinite. The Logos was a philosophical device to bridge this gulf. On the part of the Evangelist, on the other hand, as a matter of personal experience in fellowship with Jesus Christ, no such chasm existed. What Greek philosophy sought to do by the Logos conception of thought had been done experimentally for the Greek Christians by Jesus Christ, through whom God had ceased to be an object afar off and had become an experience at hand. In the thought sphere of the Greeks the Logos was the medium of God's activity in the world: in the experience sphere of the Greek Christians Jesus Christ was the medium of God's activity in the world: therefore, was deduced, Paul-like, who became a Greek to the Greek,—therefore, the Logos equals Jesus Christ.

This is the chief significance of this Gospel's identification of Jesus Christ with the Greek philosophical Logos, but there is involved a principle that deserves careful consideration. It is that of distinguishing between fact and interpretation. The great, central fact of the Gospel, clearly recognized by our Evangelist as shall appear later on, is Jesus Christ himself and the experience awakened in those who come under his influence. The interpretation of the fact is the explanation which men have given of Jesus and his power over them—the answers which have been made to the questions that are raised wherever Jesus Christ has been preached: "Who is this?" and "How can these things be?" The primary thing, the abiding element of the Gospel, is Jesus Christ himself and his peren-

nial influence over the hearts and lives of those who come into personal relationship with him—the same yesterday, today, and forever. The interpretation is in order that the fact may be apprehended among men, and is of necessity changeable from one generation to another, in consequence of which it is true that each of the more vital Christian ages, as it has been said, has had in a very real sense its own Christ. The consideration of prime importance is not whether Jesus Christ was such a one as the term *Logos* connotes, or the term *Messiah*, but that these terms were adequate to the task of making Jesus Christ himself real and alive to those who thus conceived of him. These terms enabled the story of God in Christ to be told so as to quicken in them a vital faith as the substance of their highest hopes and most ardent desires, and believing, they had life in his name, which the writer of the Fourth Gospel explicitly states to be the object and purpose of his Gospel (John, XX: 31).

We have no such current speculative situation to meet as the second century had, and there is no logical justification for our drawing the conclusion as they did, namely that the *Logos* is the preëxistent Christ. The first term of the syllogism does not exist for us, that is, that the *Logos* is the medium of God's activity in the world. Consequently neither does the conclusion exist for us, namely, that the *Logos* is Jesus Christ. The second term does exist for us as for them—the experience, through fellowship with Christ, of God's presence and activity in the world, and this links us across the ages to the Christians of the primitive days of our religion. It is true that we also have a philosophical situation to meet and we shall have to consider this before we can interpret Jesus Christ adequately to this age, but that is another matter. At this point of the discussion it is sufficient to note that the vital thing is our experience awakened in fellowship with Jesus Christ, which is for us as for the early Christians, an experience of oneness with God as the Presence who is Himself the ground of all existence, the life of the world, and the light of mankind.

It was to interpret this experience to the Greeks that the Logos conception was utilized—an experience which we share with them but which the Logos conception neither interprets to us nor is capable of awakening within us. Consequently to continue to construe the person and work of Jesus Christ in terms of the Logos metaphysics seems not only useless but fatal to the truth which it no longer expresses and the experience which it is not capable of evoking. We are suffering now from this theological anachronism, against which voices of authority are being raised in protest on all sides. A well-known theologian declares that we are in possession of a barren dogma of Christ instead of a living faith in him. A philosopher asserts that we have a Christology from which one flees as from a ghost, without ever having seen Jesus. A psychologist affirms that the sublime figure of Jesus Christ has been reduced to a state of degradation to which patristic metaphysics has banished him. And a sociologist says that the figure of Jesus is like one of his pictures in Byzantine art, splendid against its background of gold but unreal and inhuman. Unless we are willing to have the truth abide alone, fruitless and powerless like the unsown seed, it will have to be rescued from its ancient forms and given expression in the thought forms of our own age. We must tell the story of God in Christ in such a way, by the aid of historical research and by the interpretative power of our own philosophic thought, that men may know of a truth “life of our life he lives today.”

2. THE INCARNATION.

“And the Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us.” This is the fundamental fact and the central theme of the Fourth Gospel, as it is the saving power of Christianity.

It should be observed, however, that removed as we are by many centuries from the philosophical thought in which this Gospel lived and moved and had its being, it is easy for us to mistake the significance of this declaration. What the Fourth Gospel sought to establish beyond the shadow of doubt, by the

doctrine of the Incarnation, was not primarily the metaphysics employed but the historical fact of Jesus' personality. It is the glory of this Gospel, that, notwithstanding the supermundane conception according to which Jesus Christ is viewed, it declares in unmistakable terms that he was an historical personage. It aimed resolutely to do this, and so marked is this characteristic of the Gospel that it furnishes good grounds for thinking that it was meant to answer those who denied the earthly life of Christ, that is, the Gnostics. Notwithstanding the Logos nature attributed to Jesus throughout the Gospel, it is evident that the author set before himself the task of showing definitely that the power of Christianity lay in its vital and indissoluble relation to Jesus Christ himself. This accounts for the distinctly human traits of the Christ of this Gospel, which has given it at all times a warm place in the hearts of the people. Contradictory as it may seem, because of the miraculous character of his portrait, the Christ of the Fourth Gospel is even more human than the Christ of the synoptics. His humanity is declared as a dogma and consistently maintained to the end. He is represented as tired and thirsty, as troubled, as suffering, as weeping, as praying, as solicitous for his mother's welfare after his death, and in death his body presents a truly human appearance, not that of a phantom. With all the Logos features of the Christ the portrayal is that of one who had lived and died as a man among men.

It is this fact that distinguishes the Logos theory of the Fourth Gospel from that of all others—Hebrew and Greek alike—the incarnation of the Logos, which was a revolutionary doctrine for those times. Up to this point Hellenic readers of the Gospel were on fairly familiar ground. There are those who think that the Prologue was written after the Gospel was composed, and that for no other reason than to entice the unsuspecting by a show of Logos ideas in accord with prevailing views. However this may be there is an essentially irreconcilable divergence from prevailing views when it is declared that the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us.

A situation confronts us today not unlike that which Christianity faced in the second century. It is that of the dogmatic denial of the historicity of Jesus and the substitution of the "Christ-ideal"—an inheritance of pagan prototypes, and a Saviour which humanity has evolved for its own salvation. Says a representative of this school: "The story of Heracles was certainly a myth, but the Heracles ideal was a potent factor in Greece which accomplished much in shaping the convictions and aspirations of Grecian youths, and in the same sense Christ is an actuality in the Christian Church; he is a superpersonal presence in the minds of his followers, more important than any historical person, Jesus, or Paul or any apostle and all the saints."

This school of thought has a large following today among a multitude of people to whom the ancient scholasticism of orthodoxy no longer appeals. They prefer the "Christ-ideal" to the Christ of dogma. But there is another alternative. It is the Christ of history, which a vast amount of historical research and study is gradually establishing upon a satisfying basis of scientific knowledge. More than that the emphasis must be placed upon the personality of Christ and not his metaphysical features. In this respect the Fourth Gospel occupies an important position. Not the Logos nature, we have seen, but the personality of Jesus Christ is its fundamental thesis, and it is also the ground upon which its theology is built. The Logos theory was an afterthought and a deduction of logic, the sole object and purpose of which was to make Jesus Christ himself real and vital to those who were thinking in Logos terms. It is this fact that makes this Gospel a true one, like the other three, whose power likewise lay not in the Messianic mode of apprehending Jesus Christ but in his personality; and however differently he may be conceived in thought forms from one generation to another it is the personality of Jesus Christ himself that is the power of God unto salvation in all ages. "Personality is the mightiest force which God can bring to bear upon man, and the Supreme Personality in all history,

the most potent factor in all civilized change and progress, is that of Jesus Christ."

3. THE REVELATION OF GOD.

It should be conceded that the view set forth of the fundamental importance of the personality of Jesus Christ does not exhaust the significance of the Fourth Gospel's doctrine of the Incarnation. This may be further considered appropriately under this division—the Revelation of God, which is indeed a phase of the same subject.

In the discussion of the Logos the writer has taken the ground that this philosophical conception was appropriated by the author of the Fourth Gospel to give a rational account of a religious experience and to awaken the same in others, namely, an experience of God's presence who is Himself the ground of existence, the life of the world, and the light of mankind. This is also true: the Logos theory was the final outcome of centuries of philosophic searching to find the Reality behind phenomena—the ultimate Reason. It may, therefore, be granted that when the Fourth Gospel declared that the Logos became flesh it was understood that Christianity claimed to have discovered the age-long object of search in the person of Jesus Christ. That is to say, as the Prologue asserts, no man hath seen God at any time: it was Jesus Christ who has declared him. This is the climax of the Prologue as it is of the Gospel. The Prologue recognizes that God had been revealing Himself from the beginning. There was the Light which enlightens every man; the law was given through Moses but it was from God; John the Baptist was a man sent of God, the last of a long line of prophets who bore witness to the Light. These, however, were partial revelations,—mere reflections of the Light. Jesus Christ was no partial revelation, no mere reflection. He not merely taught men concerning God but in his own person he disclosed the essential nature of God. In seeing Jesus the Fourth Gospel maintains men saw the Father.

This, however, was a moral and spiritual revelation. In

the personality of Jesus Christ the character of God was revealed as that of a Father. God, whose essential nature is love, was revealed in the character of the Perfect Man. The writer is willing to face the challenge which is urged against this view when it is asked: How comes it that the process of evolution flowered so far back in history instead of at the end of the ages? The Fourth Gospel answers this challenge with the presentation of an idealized Christ. The flowering process of evolution is not yet complete, but its completion is anticipated in the Christ of this Gospel. And this is the significance of the Church's doctrine of the glorification of Christ. The Christ of Christianity is the Christ of history idealized in Christian experience.

In this experience, the Fourth Gospel recognized the half-truth of Gnosticism that the world's Saviour must have an ideal as well as an historical significance. But unlike Gnosticism the ideal significance of Christ is found in the historical life that he lived. The ideal Christ is thus no mere "Christ-ideal," no mere abstraction, but Christ in the power of a personality achieved on the battle field of this life, and raised by the process of idealization to its highest terms. Our own experiences will enable us to appreciate this. The writer has seen something of the divinity in womanhood set forth in abstract discussions. He has seen something more of it disclosed in fiction by means of imaginary characters. He has seen it further revealed by use of the art of dramatization and the histrionic art. But all this is in no wise comparable to what he has seen shining on the face of his mother since she has gone from his physical presence, after it was given him to have her forty years. Nor can he be persuaded that what he sees in her now, to which his eyes were holden during her life-time, has no reality. Yea, it is all true, and during the remainder of his years, time and occasion will not be able to exhaust the resources and treasures of her personality for him. Such idealization is true: it is a process standing in the order of the universe as firmly as the process of evolution, and it is the highest

mode of divine revelation. It is God's way of revealing Himself to us. He it is who takes our beloved in death and causes a heavenly radiance to stream from them into our hearts. And it is God who took the matchless life of Jesus that he lived among men, and in death, yea, the death of the cross, caused the light of the glory of God Himself to shine in his face. When, therefore, the Evangelist of the Fourth Gospel asserted, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father; he hath declared him," he gave expression, not to what flesh and blood had revealed unto him but the Spirit of the Father Himself, and he gave expression to the highest possible truth concerning him, who thenceforth and forever was seen to be not merely the founder of Christianity, but its object, and the very goal toward which the whole creation moves. In him God is seen—the end of creation as its beginning. The ultimate reality behind phenomena finds adequate expression in Christianity's idealized personality, The Invisible and Inscrutable looks forth upon His creation in that one Face, which becomes our "universe that feels and knows." "Call Christ the illimitable God."

"So the All-Great were the All-Loving too—
So, through the thunder comes a human voice
Saying: 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!
Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
Thou hast no power nor mayst conceive of mine:
But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
And thou must love me who have died for thee!'"

To the writer the age in which we live seems urgently in need of Jesus Christ as the revelation of God. We are living in a world that is fast becoming to all a world under the reign of law—irrefragable law. It permeates nature through and through, conditions, on the one hand, the molecular organizations of matter, and, on the other hand, the planets in their courses, and embraces within its grasp all life from the lowest even unto the highest forms. The universe is conceived to be "lawful to its very core." In this mental atmosphere the first article of the creed may still be held, but the creed of many

contains no other article, and belief in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, is a stoic acceptance of "the eternal sternness of the world order." It may be expressed in the familiar lines:

"Though the mills of God grind slowly,
Yet they grind exceeding small.
Though with patience He stands waiting,
With exactness grinds He all."

The cry of the second century, "show us the Father and it sufficeth us," expresses the permanent need of humanity but of no age more than ours. The answer of the Fourth Gospel is the only one that really meets this need:

" 'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
Thou shall love and be loved by, forever: a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of a new life to Thee! See the Christ stand! "

BALTIMORE, MD.

III

GENERAL SYNOD'S YEAR OF JUBILEE.

J. I. SWANDER.

A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you (Lev. 25: 11).

This divine statute, authorizing and regulating the year of jubilee, was one of the most significant incorporated in the Mosaic Code. Its provisions were associated with the great day of atonement. As such it was designed to protect the poor in their freedom against the possible exorbitance and tyranny of the heartless rich: and while it aimed to secure such temporal immunities it had a prophetic significance to be fulfilled in the possession of greater wealth and liberty by all mankind when "the ransomed of the Lord should return and come to Zion with songs of everlasting joy upon their heads, when sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

As thus prophetic of better things to come, the Hebrew Jubilee looks toward its final realization and fulfillment in the final crisis or terminal point of human history. We are now passing through that interval of time made up of successive periods punctuated by epochs in the onflow of the world's progress.

In this general onflow there are two distinct streams. While both start from a human fountain, they are nevertheless directed and dominated by different forces, and, therefore flow on to different destinies. The one though poisoned by human sin yet still retains much of its primitive energy: the other, because of a new fountain opened up in the house of David, counteracts the abnormal forces that still inhere in its constitution. They flow along lines somewhat similar and seemingly parallel, at times mingling their elements and clashing their currents,

but are destined to meet different ethical terminations. The one stream, starting in humanity perverted by sin, must pour its contents into the receptacle of its own abortion: the other, starting in humanity regenerated by the mystery of Bethlehem, becomes the central channel of the world's history, and is the ever refreshing stream that makes glad the City of our God, the habitation of the Most High.

Could we pause and poise ourselves upon some summit of commanding eminence, with the angle of our visual organ properly adjusted, and see the panorama of the ages passing by, we would not envy the seer of Patmos with the splendid scenery of heaven uncurtained to his raptured vision.

Thus perched, we would watch the meandering course of the turbulent stream whose waters had been poisoned by the perverted life of the first Adam, flowing down the murky current of the ages, alienated from the life of God; we would observe the rising of nations, the founding of empires, and the falling away of dynasties; cities springing into ephemeral existence, and then buried in the dust of oblivion; armies marching and countermarching until in deepening combat they are in one red burial blent; all teaching one sad, sad lesson that the path of all such glory leads but to the grave.

Upon the other hand we would look at a higher type of humanity begotten by the quickening spirit, the Lord from heaven, born into a higher Kingdom, baptized on the day of Pentecost, unfolding itself progressively in virtue of the presence and power of the divine man of Galilee, in the church, marking the milestones of its progress in the records of the ecumenical councils from the first synod in Jerusalem to Nicea, on to Constantinople, Calcedon, Ephesus, Toledo, Basle and Zurich to the organization of the general synod at Pittsburgh, 1863.

The greater number of the delegates then present to take part in the organization of the general synod have entered into rest. They have gone to enrich the society of the heavenly world. Their deeds are in history. Themselves are with Christ which is for better.

Only a few of us have been spared, and we are tottering monuments of God's amazing goodness. How rare the privilege to pass over and look back upon a half century of intervening years to that great epoch in the history of the Reformed Church. The impression, though somewhat hazy, still lingers with comparative vividness upon the tablets of our memories. We still see Dr. John Williamson Nevin arising to assume the duties of the presidency. We recall hearing his keynote sermon on *Jesus Christ and him crucified*. We also remember distinctly hearing him on the following Lord's day in one of the churches of the city on the text "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" (Heb. 10:19). He began by laying aside his spectacles, and with an almost stammering eloquence exhorted us to come, not with presumption, but with the boldness of broken spirits and contrite hearts to a throne of grace.

That was in many respects a most remarkable general assembly. It is questionable, indeed, whether Nicea with all its primitive precedency surpassed it in all the elements of Christian greatness. Dr. Nevin presided with a supreme dignity worthy of comparison, if not contrast with Hosius or any other proxy of Constantine the Great when the bishops of Christendom had for the first time come together from all the ends of the earth.

The ministers and elders had come together at Pittsburgh with a desire to be of one accord in one place. The occasion and the times were such as to call for both genuine patriotism and piety. There were two questions confronting them, either one of which would have been enough to have thrown combustion into a less fraternal assembly. The east and the west were not yet in full agreement on the question of Christian cultus, neither were the north and south in accord as to the principle of civil government. The thundering artillery which had shaken the sepulchers of Cemetery Hill at Gettysburg still rolled their echoes across the Allegheny mountains; yet the brethren dwelled together in unity. The indulgence of

their charity was equalled only by the sincerity of their convictions. There was but one flaming meteor in their sky. Let brotherly love continue! In Hoc Signo Vinces. That star outshone the boreal display that led Constantine to place the diadem of Cæsar upon the brow of Christendom. It requires neither a prolific imagination nor an eloquent tongue to give the year of our Lord 1863 its proper setting in the onflow of the world's great history. At that time, as never before, the prophetic past was rushing toward its fulfillment in that progressive hereafter so close at hand. The declaration of American independence had just been born again in the emancipation of American slaves. The nations of the earth stood aghast at the unparalleled activities in the civil, military, and religious movement upon our planet. Japan had opened the portals of the east for the light of western civilization. The philosophy of Germany was about to be sifted of its chaff, while its wheat was being sown in all stalwart thinking of the world's progressive schools, and restlessness reigned from Cancer to Capricorn. From the Orient to the Occident the world was either a pool of stagnation or a seething caldron of furious elements. It was felt on every hand that accumulated forces of history were sooner or later to meet in America as time's last stage for time's last play.

Barring the periods that began at Bethlehem, Pentecost and the Reformation in the sixteenth century, the last fifty years has been the most important section of history since the beginning of time. Indeed it may be truthfully and seriously claimed that the last half century has been more productive in startling events, and more directly progressive toward the terminal point of history than any fifty centuries preceding it. Inventions, discoveries and signal triumphs of genius in arts and sciences have almost crowded each other from the stage in their rush to appear before the footlights of the approaching millennial day. As never before, nature has revealed the secrets which she could no longer hold from the knowledge of man. Hence the marvelous advent of human achievements

now coming in upon us with a sweep of power before which the pearly gates themselves must soon be made to stand ajar.

The most notable movements of the last half century may be classified as follows:

Those which had their origin in the restlessness of the world which ever groaneth and travaileth in pain waiting for some new revelation of truth to realize the dreams which have vaped in all the traditions of its past and yearned through all the imaginations of its future, those which have had their genesis in the Kingdom of God as embodied in the Holy Catholic Church; and those which, like the murky current of the river Nile, have had their source in the mountains of the moon, or some other high altitude of religious lunacy, as for example Mrs. Blavotsky's theosophy, Mrs. Eddy's Christian Science and John A. Dowie's divine healing as miserable mummeries of modern manichaeism.

Perhaps the most forceful and fascinating movement of the period now under review was that of Darwinian evolution. In 1864, one year after the organization of the general synod, the Royal Society of London granted Charles Robert Darwin the Copley medal and thus crowned him as king immortal in the realm of biological research.

In 1871, he gave the world his treatise on *The Descent of Man*. It startled the stagnant schools into new activity. Moses seemed in danger of being sent back to the bulrushes. Much of the theology of the church was shocked into spasms of holy consternation. The zoological garden was about to be substituted for the Garden of Eden. The monoron and the monkey were about to be developed into manhood. Christendom was startled with a fair inference from the Darwinian theory that the blood of Calvary had coursed its way through the veins of an ape.

Yet science is wiser today, because of the advent of organic evolution. With all its defects, Darwinism is a blessing to the whole family of the sciences. The cloud that seemed so full of disaster to traditional orthodoxy has burst with a flood of

sunshine upon the whole field of biologic investigation. The scholastic compass now suggests new bearings. Biology has been born again. Organic progress is now seen to be God's manner of doing things. Cosmos culminates in man. The lower orders of being are prophetic of the higher *without being parental thereto*.

After Darwinism had projected itself into the seething commotion of the world as a challenge to its accepted theories of ontology, later in the seventies, A. Wilford Hall appeared above its hazy horizon in his *Problem of Human Life*. In this book he assailed Darwinism in a most radical and vigorous manner. Gathering momentum with the progress of the discussion, Hall proceeded to call into question current theories in the science of physics as then taught in the schools and generally believed on in the world. His writings were at first received with favor. Later on his position in physics was criticized without mercy and condemned without thorough investigation. Even to this day his challenge to the schools remains unanswered. His philosophy is not dead, but sleepeth, and history is bound to repeat another section of itself. The corn of wheat has only fallen into the ground and the sepulcher of its germinal truth will again be opened in God's own resurrection day. Jewish prejudice, Grecian philosophy and Roman pride still cast their shadows across the path of the world's sunrise. It required 300 years for the light that dawned over Moab's hills to flash its rays around the throne of the Cæsars, become the accepted religion of the Roman empire, and receive its proper recognition as "the bright and morning star" of the world's last hope.

During these productive years the world had begun to make its most rapid advance in its industrial arts; its multiplicity and multiformity of mechanical implements and labor-saving contrivances, in the shops and mines and upon the farms; in its astounding acquirements and amassments of wealth; its organizations of greed and abominations of graft; its monopolizations of business and combinations of gigantic trusts; its in-

iquitous distinctions between brain and brawn; its unjustifiable conflicts between capital and labor; the confusions that arose and darkened the very heavens with the confounding of true and false socialism; the consequent reëxamination of the foundations of human society, the rebuilding of the social superstructure, more fair in its proportions and more in agreement with that great plan of the moral universe ordained by the Man of Gallilee.

The most marvelous discoveries of the last fifty years have been in the development of and connection with the science of electrodynamics. While the Pittsburgh synod was being organized the world was having a jubilee over the triumphs of Morse, Jenkins and Field, and also standing on tiptoe of anxiety over an attempt to throw a magnetic cable around the world. In less than a decade of years that gigantic undertaking was accomplished. In a new fulfillment of the old prophecy their lines had gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world.

A conductor of the electric fluid passed over the highest mountains and under the deepest oceans of the planet. Following, in 1880, was the full discovery and practical operation of telephonic communication, and such rapid progress of the mystic science that the nineteenth century went out in a blaze of glory around Marconi's deathless name when he demonstrated that messages could be dispatched around the earth without a metallic medium of conduction.

That amazing miracle of wireless telegraphy was the greatest triumph of human genius ever achieved by man or recorded in the annals of human affairs since the closing of the garden gates of Eden upon the fugitive heels of the federal pair.

If it be not a miracle, it is at least superlatively marvelous. If it involves none of the elements strictly supernatural, it certainly challenges and calls into service some of the invisible elements of *this* world, and as never before, fastens them as new steeds to the chariot of human progress now being made in the direction of the heavenly empire.

The discovery, in the last half of the nineteenth century, of telephonic power and a new medium of telegraphic conduction for the transmission of voice and thought, will stand as perpetual reminders, while future years roll by, of the inventive skill and scientific progress of that generation.

As these great movements of profound and searching inquiry were rolling themselves into historic position in accordance with God's purpose and in the direction of that "far away divine event toward which the whole creation moves," contemporary developments were taking place in the Kingdom of the coming Christ which ruleth over all. Why not? If science can extract secrets from the bosom of nature, why should not progressive and prevailing Christianity seek to pillow itself more closely upon the bosom of that *Infinite One* whose omnipotent benevolence causes the heart of the moral universe to throb with everlasting pulsations?

In 1846 Dr. Schaff wrote and published his *Principles of Protestantism and Historic Development*. The dawn of a new era then flashed its light out of Zion. Historic development is now generally accepted and acknowledged as a principle peculiar to legitimate protestantism. The moment that Protestantism denies the truth of this proposition it proclaims its own bastardy to the world, and hangs its own scalp upon the belt of the old man by the Tiber. The Romish theory has no room for a growing revelation and the evolution of christianity. Its dogmas are all carved out to full perfection in the laboratory of papal infallibility. This doctrine of infallibility was announced with emphasis in the Vatican at Rome in 1870—just seven years after the organization of the general synod. Hence the attempt at that time of Father Hyacinthe in France and his coadjutor, Dr. Döllinger, in Germany.

“While Rome her recent dogma raised
Dolinger called a new refrain,
And Munich all her banners waved,
But Munich's banners waved in vain.
Great reformations do not come,
By floating flags and beating drum.

Great progress 'long the line of right
Is not by revolution
Nor by spasmodic spurts of might,
But through slow evolution,
And God's true Zion learns to wait,
Since heaven is always up to date."

Since the organization of general synod time has demonstrated the truth of progressive christianity. Historical development has practically been the evangelical slogan of an awakening church. By a historic series of judgments, God had made known his power unto Pharaoh; why should he not continue to make known more clearly his ways unto Moses and his acts unto the children of Israel? He is doing so as his stately steppings are echoed down the halls of Zion, in the light of a growing revelation of his will to mankind.

The growing recognition of the fact of historic development, as a principle of Protestantism, accounts in part for the discoveries by Christian scholarship and the consequent claims of the *higher or biblical criticism* in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The fruit of historic development was to stimulate the commendable spirit of inquiry and research as never before. Such criticism, when in its sober mood, became destructive of much unwarranted tradition and constructive of better methods, the more chronological arrangement of Old Testament books, and the placing of a more proper estimate and value of their literary sources and canonical worth. New discoveries of old manuscripts brought inspired truth out of the sepulchers of antiquity; new apprehensions of the truth called for new phrasings of the old creeds and confessions; and new advances in real Christian Science made new revisions necessary in the old versions of sacred scriptures, and a recast of much superannuated theology.

In this advance movement the Reformed Church assumed her position and performed her part; and the last half century shows that she has performed that part with Christian fidelity and scholarly ability. Each succeeding triennium is in evidence upon this point. The Pittsburgh synod of 1863, being

the first convocation of the church under its new form, the delegates from the east and west, convened in the fellowship of fraternal greetings and organized its highest judicatory in the bonds of Christian charity. The glorified spirit of Ulrich Zwingli, which had manifested itself so magnanimously at Marburg, was present to vapor within the walls that surrounded that first general assembly of accredited delegates. The east, having agreed upon the provisional liturgy as generally acceptable, was permitted to continue its provisional use, and the west, having asked permission to prepare a liturgy for themselves, was authorized to go forward in the enjoyment of such freedom in Christian worship.

The synod at Dayton, 1866, can never be relegated to a place of small importance in the history of the Reformed Church. The East, having revised the provisional liturgy, under the title of *An Order of Worship*, submitted it as a book "proper to be used by such ministers and congregations as were prepared to introduce it in whole or in part." The majority of the committee to which the matter was referred reported with a recommendation that its use be so "allowed." At this point the issue was made and followed with a discussion lasting three memorable days. The contention was not so much over the question as to a form of worship as it was over the doctrinal system underlying the book in controversy. It was a battle of giants. Conspicuous among the champions were Dr. J. W. Nevin and Dr. Henry Harbaugh on the one hand and Dr. J. H. Good and Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger upon the other side. Great and good men! They are now doubtless looking down upon us from the heavenly world, if indeed, they are not mingling with us in the jubilations of this year.

The memorable engagement at Dayton was not fought out to a finish for the very sufficient reason that the battle-line could not be clearly drawn because of the multiplicity of points at issue. The one party held that in no age of the church militant can Christendom attain to a full and correct apprehension of the truth; the other party maintained that already

three hundred and fifty years ago the Reformers had attained to a fullness of heavenly vision and were already perfect in the creeds and customs handed down for standards of doctrine and directories of worship for all the ages to follow. The one party laid greater stress upon the *objective* and the other upon the *subjective* facts and factors in the grand economy of the world's redemption. The one party began its theological ratiocinations with the divine philosophy of St. John; the other viewed the general subject of human salvation from the standpoint of the equally divine soteriology of St. Paul. The one party took its point of view at Bethlehem, the other surveyed the whole field from the standpoint of Golgotha. The one party emphasized the fact that

“The King of glory came from far
To make his truth and mercy known,
The cradle his triumphal car,
The virgin mother's arms his throne;
Darkness his curtain, dust his bed,
He slept in death to wake the dead.”

The other party just as properly made a more special survey of

“The wondrous cross
On which the King of glory died.”

These issues so overlapped each other as to make the engagement one of great confusion, fought out by moonlight, with much popgun artillery. Neither party was wrong except in the fact that there was too generally a putting asunder what God had joined together in the deepest councils of eternity.

In 1869 general synod met at Philadelphia in a session of commendable Christian prudence. It was then and there decided by a vote of 117 to 57 that a maturely developed apprehension of Christian truth and a corresponding directory of Christian worship were matters of growth rather than of ecclesiastical legislation. The vote was a record of a partially conscious recognition of the protestant principle of historic devel-

opment. Having so settled, temporarily, the doctrinal and liturgical questions at issue, the synod in the city of brotherly love resolved to enter fraternally and more vigorously upon the practical work of home and foreign missions.

The third triennium in the history of the general synod—from 1869 to 1872—was a period in which the brethren fairly provoked each other unto good works. The action at Philadelphia left the field open for Christian competition in the issues as read between the lines of forbearance, toleration and indefinite postponement of the finality. Great zeal was displayed by both parties and on every hand. The matter held to be of great importance was to educate and send forth a truly “orthodox” ministry for the coming wars of the Lord. Hence the unusual effort to man and manage and endow our literary and theological institutions already in operation, and to establish and equip others. This trend of activity involved the question of the appropriation of the Church’s benevolent funds. The matter came up in the synod of Cincinnati, 1872. It confronted the assembly in the Dunn appeal case, in the disposal of which the general synod took the action which in its judgment allowed the greatest democratic liberty consistent with the more supreme authority of the church.

The general synod at Fort Wayne, 1875, was an assembly to which the Reformed Church may look back with pious pleasure and pride as long as the years of time roll by. By considerate action it continued the discretionary use of the two liturgies temporarily authorized at Philadelphia; it left the regulation of theological professors to the respective district synods within whose bounds they may teach. It guarded the sacredness of the relation between the conscience of the individual worshiper and his God; it stamped with disapproval the growing disregard for the holiness of domestic ties by declaring “that the marriage bond is indissoluble, except by natural death, and that there is no validity in divorce except for the reason assigned by our Lord,” and that adultery is divorce.

At Lancaster, Pa., 1878, the general synod held a most re-

markable session. It demonstrated, as never before, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." The logic of love carried its syllogism toward a conclusion of peace. The synod, there and then, proclaimed its sincere desire and purpose that there should be "unity in essential, liberty in doubtful, and charity in all things pertaining to the church." Provisions were made for the appointment of a commission to prepare a doctrinal and liturgical basis for such a proposed millennial dawn. "Let brotherly love continue" was the sentiment of that movement, and again did the breath of the Master inspire the disciples to place that motto on the badge of their Christian brotherhood.

General synod convened in Tiffin, O., 1881. The peace commission authorized at Lancaster, and constituted by the concurrent action of the district synods reported the result of their deliberations. The report was immediately put upon its adoption, and was approved by a rising and nearly unanimous vote. Observing a hesitancy on the part of a few, Dr. Thomas G. Apple arose and said: "Come, brethren, we have crossed the river; let us now burn our bridges behind us." After singing the Doxology, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," and joining in prayer led by Dr. Benjamin Bousman, the synod appointed the members of the commission a committee to prepare a new liturgy or directory of worship for the whole Reformed Church in the United States.

The synod of Baltimore, 1884, was calm in its reflections upon the past and hopeful in its anticipations of the future. The liturgical committee, appointed at Tiffin, reported the fruit of its long and laborious task. The report, after much discussion, was adopted, and its work referred to the several classes for approval or rejection. The synod adjourned to wait in great suspense through another triennium.

That triennium ended at Akron in 1887. It was one of much anxiety as to the action of the classes respecting the submitted directory of worship. This anxiety was removed when the report to the synod showed that a majority had given

an affirmative vote for the new book, approving the same as an ordinance. Whereupon the general synod "declared that the same was constitutionally adopted as the *Directory of Worship* in the Reformed Church in the United States."

The Reformed Church in the United States having thus ended a thirty years' war and established a peace more fruitful of good results than that of Westphalia, entered upon a new period of Christian activity. Having reunited with itself, it was ready to coöperate in an effort to unite more closely with the Reformed Church in America. The general synod at Lebanon, Pa., 1890, found an opportunity presenting itself. This gave occasion for a special session at Philadelphia, 1891. Right heartily and sincerely did our church enter into the work of answering her Lord's prayer for union among all his people. The results of that effort were disappointing to the general synod at Reading, 1893. The Reformed Church in America failed to give its approval, and the proposed union was postponed because ecclesiastical legislation was too far in advance of Christian growth in the same direction.

In 1896, thirty years after the battle between doctrinal apprehensions of everlasting truth, synod convened again in Dayton. What conservative progress had been made during these ten trienniums of eventful years! What signal victories had been achieved in the name of the Prince of peace! And during the half century past our growth has been remarkable. The records show an increase of 400 per cent. in the number of district synods, 250 per cent. in the number of classes, 240 per cent. in the number of ministers, and 300 per cent. in the number of members. We have prepared and declared a new hymnal, a directory of worship and a revised constitution as ordinances of the church. We have placed ourselves uncompromisingly upon record as opposed to whatsoever worketh an abomination or maketh a lie. We have carried the gospel to the old continent that cradled our infant Christ. We have planted the standard of Christian civilization in Sendai, and unfurled the banner of the cross in the rising empire and new

republic of the east. We have begun to offer the religion of Christ to the blind followers of Confucius. We have made commendable missionary progress in the home land. We have organized ourselves for all manner of Christian activity. We have called into being a multiplicity and multiformity of organizations, if not supernumerary societies. Our faces are turned toward the rising sun of an early millennial dawn. Our God is marching on. He is coming in this direction. Can you not hear the rumbling of his chariot-wheels? He that testifieth of these things saith: "Surely I come quickly. Even so, come, Lord Jesus! In the meantime our duty and our destiny are before us. Let us discharge the first in the activity of a rational faith, and await the other in the serenity of an immortal hope.

TIFFIN, OHIO.

IV.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.¹

GEORGE LESLIE OMWAKE.

In accepting the call to the presidency of Ursinus College, I would be untrue to the most sacred impulse of my heart if I did not first of all profess that in doing so I am prompted by the resistless power of love for the college. You may be mistaken in your estimate of my ability to serve the institution in this high office but you are not mistaken in assuming that what service I may render will be offered in unalloyed devotion.

There are a few motives entering into the compelling dictate of conscience which bids me accept the responsibilities you have laid upon me, that we do well to consider at the very outset, for they should serve to grip the soul of every man who is responsive to the needs of his fellowmen and to the will of God.

In the first place he who serves a college serves his country. The college is the crucible which converts the teeming masses of volatile youth on the one hand into the settled, law-abiding citizenship of our country on the other. The college has the unparalleled task of preparing the leaders for all the more advanced agencies of civilization. Less capable men will not do in the complex maze of forces making up our modern life. In the more or less dimly realized struggle, by which, in response to a new ethical standard and a quickened public conscience, not only our own land but every nation on the face of the earth, is trying to lift itself to a higher plane of action,

¹ The inaugural address of Geo. Leslie Omwake, Pd.D., delivered on the occasion of his inauguration as the president of Ursinus College, at Collegeville, Pa., on October 7, 1913.

the opportunity to serve our country through our colleges in our day rises to the rank of that which in an earlier age lay before our nation's founders, and later, before its defenders. To take our talented youth and fit them for leadership in our national life is a supremely patriotic duty.

But rising above the motive of patriotism is that of human helpfulness. Above the service which the college president may render to his country is that which he may render to his fellowman. An experience of more than a decade in dealing with young persons aspiring to go to college, has served to impress me deeply with the fact that here is a point of contact that presents a rare opportunity for philanthropic endeavor. To pilot a young life that is being tossed about in the fitful maelstrom of adolescent youth, guide it into the calm haven of a cultural college, instruct it in chart and compass, provide it with a ballast of solid learning, and then to confidently send it forth in full sail on life's main, is a rare privilege indeed. Moreover, constant contact with manhood and womanhood in its formative stages when every influence may have constructive value in the making of character, serves to keep burning the fires of one's enthusiasm for human worth. When an educator ceases to be an optimist he has already ceased to be an educator. To choose a career as officer or teacher in a college is then to choose a career that never fails in abundant and unique opportunity to serve one's fellowmen.

But higher still, when one is called to preside over a Christian college, he sees in it a magnificent opportunity to serve God. In Ursinus we have a Christian college, and he who would labor in this institution in any capacity enjoys the privilege not only of leading a personal Christian life unmolested, but of rendering active service in making the college itself a more effectual force in the Kingdom of God.

While your call to serve Ursinus College is thus felt to be at the same time a call to serve our country, our fellowmen and our God, this is not all. In my university days, we used to sing:

“For God, for country and for Yale.”

Ah, that is it. These separate motives become irresistible when bound up in the life and destiny of one's alma mater. Besides having gotten my collegiate training here, I have put a dozen years of service into this college. Need I tell you that I am bound to Ursinus College with bands of steel? To every alumnus and former student, let me say that if you find yourself lacking in devotion for your college, render it some service, and you will come to love it. It was when Daniel Webster was fighting for the interests of his alma mater in court that he made the famous remark: "It is a small college, sir, but there are those who love it." Except for the fact that he had come to the help of his college he doubtless would never have become inspired to give expression to that splendid sentiment. It is safe to assert, without making inquiry, that this was one case in which that great lawyer never accepted a fee. The privilege of serving one's own college rises to the rank of moral duty.

With this view of the motives entering into the acceptance of your call, I now face the special problems that must engage our attention. Here we come not heralding radical "reforms" or revolutionary measures. There are inherent in Ursinus College so many splendid ideals, valuable working principles and effective methods more or less fully wrought out, but all falling short of realizing their potential worth, that any radical disturbance of our educational system would not only subvert the interests of the College in general but would constitute a species of vandalism in our well-ordered educational household. Our task is rather to build on the foundations already laid—to steadily bring into clearer relief our dominant ideals and purposes, to work out in more specific detail our fundamental principles of organization and administration and to bring all available power to bear in the production of larger and better results. Consequently there will be no sensations, no pyrotechnics in this administration unless they are shot up unawares. We commit ourselves and all the forces we can command, rather to a "term of close confinement at hard

labor." We may be pardoned for giving expression to the belief, however, that in the long run, the process of development to which we aim to apply ourselves, will yield a college that will be both unique and superior in character and efficiency when judged by the ideals and standards which now prevail.

Educationally, and in these matters I speak for the gentlemen who are associated with me in the faculty as well as for myself, we shall aim to keep the claims of intellectual endeavor uppermost. A man cannot be well physically, sound morally or happy spiritually who does not live up pretty closely to the upper limit of his intellectual capacity. It is our business to surround the student with a comfortable environment, to provide a type of domestic life that will be conducive to health of body, to so condition the social life as to favor good morals and pure religion, and then to keep him busy with intellectual tasks. There are few joys that can surpass those of intellectual achievement. To solve a problem may be work but it should not be drudgery. We conceive a college to be a place of hard work but withal of supreme happiness.

In this connection, it should be observed that the general terms used to define education today, such as "assimilation of our racial inheritance," "adjustment to our social environment," and the like, fall far short of defining the individual effort involved in getting an education. To use a common phrase current in other fields of discussion, these representations of the educational process lack "teeth." The college lad cannot take a course of study by merely being "exposed to it," as a father jocularly remarked regarding the inoculation of his son with a certain subject in school. We are impressed rather with the idea expressed in a class room in this building during my own college days by Professor Samuel Vernon Ruby, of blessed memory, whose experience as a soldier filled his heart with the military spirit and stored his mind with the imagery of war. Rising to his feet, he thundered with terrific emphasis, reënforced by a vigorous blow upon his desk, "There can be no progress in this world, *except by the clash of minds.*"

May that conception continue to influence the intellectual exercises carried on in this place.

A very serious problem confronting certain college administrators today is how to keep a Christian college Christian. Apparently denominational control has little to do with the real problem. The most truly Christian institution I ever attended, not excluding the theological seminary, was a state institution. Nor does doctrinal belief settle the question. We must look, rather, to the *conduct* of those making up the college for the tests of its religious character. We shall be misled also if we attempt to get at the character of an institution by striking an average. Just as a chain is as weak as its weakest link, so a college is as bad as the worst person in it; and just as a chain may be made vastly stronger by taking out the one weak link, so a college may be made vastly better by the single act of dismissing one bad individual. A college that is professedly Christian has a right to expect every person in it to make an honest effort, whatever may be his belief, to act in accordance with the cardinal principles of Christianity, and the maintenance of the college's character requires that he who refuses so to do be eliminated from its social body.

I must also refer on this occasion to another set of duties and responsibilities which confront the college head, namely, those involved in the administration of its fiscal affairs. As a matter of policy, I hope that Ursinus College will keep its rates of tuition and its cost of living at such a level that it can continue to command the patronage of self-supporting students and those of limited means. The requirements of our age are enforcing upon young men everywhere the necessity of higher education. Thousands of young persons are planning to go to college every year, whereas, a generation ago they would have looked upon such a course as an impossible dream. These persons, with noble self-reliance, undertake, in many instances, to finance their college courses unaided. For this class of students our doors must be kept open. This precludes the

students. Even colleges whose charges are very much higher than those prevailing here must accumulate gifts and endowments to save themselves from financial failure.

A task, therefore, to which the present administration must address itself frankly is the increase of funds with which to maintain our growing work. This task properly belongs to the directors of a college, but assistance, and perhaps even leadership, in promoting the temporal welfare of an institution may rightly be expected of its president. It is through the president that benefactors may get impressions of the worth of the college and become acquainted with its needs, while to directors they naturally look for assurance of safe business management and activity in building up the material resources. On this side of my work I shall be prompted by the same motives and guided by the same principles as in the building up of the educational life of the institution. In all things, I shall rely on the unreserved support of directors, faculty, alumni, students and friends, in which several bodies our institution has abundant ability for the accomplishment of its purposes.

COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

V.

ADDRESS AT THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT OMWAKE.¹

J. G. HIBBEN.

I count it a great privilege to bear to you upon this occasion the felicitations of a sister university, and to rejoice with you in the promise of the bright future which lies before you under the administration of your new president.

From the beginnings of your history you have always consistently maintained a certain type of education which has found its justification in the quality of the men it has produced. Although professing no creed of Pragmatism I am quite willing to accept the pragmatic test of any educational system and estimate it according to its fruitage value. Measured by this standard, you may well be proud of the human product of this institution, the men who have gone forth from this place to serve their day and generation.

As we gather together at this time to wish you Godspeed in the continuance of the great work which you have undertaken, it may be well for us to discuss for a few moments the central educational purpose which should guide us all as teachers in our efforts to prepare our young men for the active duties of life. It seems to me that the sacred trust which is peculiarly ours as teachers may be expressed in terms of the supreme obligation resting upon us to train our students in the art of seeing.

You, who have been called to be not only a teacher but in your new office also a leader of teachers, you should have be-

¹ An address delivered by John Grier Hibben, Ph.D., LL.D., president of Princeton University, at Collegeville, Pa., on October 7, 1913.

fore you an ultimate aim, clearly defined in your own mind, and towards which the nature of your curriculum, the methods of instruction, and all the influences of this college world should definitely and steadily contribute. And I believe that such a supreme end, dominating policy and determining procedure, can be most comprehensively expressed as the purpose to furnish to darkened eyes a faculty of sight and to present before them an ever changing field of vision.

We live in an age where an especial emphasis has been placed upon the training of the powers of observation as the primary and most essential feature of the true method of education. From this point of view knowledge is to grow by means of a more and more intimate contact with the world through the senses. While I believe most emphatically that it is of an inestimable advantage to train the eye so as to increase both the range of vision and the accuracy of minute discrimination, nevertheless, a more profound and a more significant phase of such training is the corresponding development of the inner vision. It is the eye of the *mind* to which we must give our most careful concern, that it may attain that power of penetration which sees beneath the surface appearance and apprehends the lower levels of meaning and significance. Our North American Indian has been famed for his almost abnormal power of acute observation. But we must remember that in that primitive school of nature in which he has received his rude training, there has been also a quickening of his powers of inference so that the things he sees about him, the forest trail, the smoke on the distant horizon, the flight of birds, the drifting clouds, all tell a story which he has learned to interpret, and to adapt to his own use and advantage. It is not what one sees but what one understands which avails. And every phase of education should tend to create and develop this understanding mind.

While the outer eye may see only two objects in the field of vision, it is the eye of the mind which sees in addition the underlying relations which exist between them. The mind is

capable of appreciating all that these objects suggest as well as all that they directly reveal. In every process of vision the *contribution made by the mind* is the all important factor. The characteristic feature of scholarly thought is that it is reflective, and reflective thought is that which is carried on in the light which the mind itself creates. By means of this inner illumination the mind is capable of seeing the implication which is contained in any situation in the field of vision. Reason thus transcends the actual scene, and apprehends its thought value. In this faculty of interpretation by means of the process of inference, it is the recognition of the casual connection between the various objects of our observation which gives thought its wide range and commanding power. The relation of cause and effect is something which can never be seen through the senses; it is a matter wholly of the mind's grasp of a situation. Plato has defined the philosopher, and the definition applies equally well to the scholar, as one who possesses a synoptic mind, that is, a mind which sees things together. Through this power of seeing how things hang together sure experiences are systematically correlated, and we come to know not merely a catalogue of facts, but something also of their underlying connection, as to how and why they are what they are. To appreciate the universal significance of the special case and to rise from the mere fact to the law which it illustrates, this is the art of seeing. Whatever may be the particular subject of our study, we never master it until we have established a center to which all the significant lines of casual connection definitely converge—every method of instruction, every pedagogical device, should have in view, as an ultimate end, the quickening of this casual sense. The successful physician, statesman or man of affairs, must possess this ability of seeing the future in the present—and this can be done only by discovering the ground in reason which is the adequate basis for his prediction.

This faculty of inner vision is peculiarly a power of discrimination. It is said of Solomon when he came to the throne

that the most valuable gift with which God endowed him was that of a discerning judgment. Any method of education which is capable of justifying itself must produce that keenness of thought which cuts to the central core of a subject. The skilled fireman may give us who are teachers a suggestive hint. In fighting the flames, he is trained to make a dash to the heart of the fire. To get at "the heart of the fire," to see things from a commanding center, to be able to separate the essential elements of a situation from the unessential, to discard everything which does not bear directly upon the point of issue and thus secure a concentration of control,—this is the greatest of all mental gifts.

The art of seeing also depends upon the ability to appropriate the vision of another. There is such a thing as a vicarious experience, of seeing through the eyes of others, hearing through their ears, and thinking their thoughts after them. One of the essential features of any process of education is the training which enables us to master the reports which come to us from the general thought and work of the world. We must learn the secret of making history our servant. We cannot proceed solely by a method of trial and error. There is a wonderfully suggestive power in a richly furnished mind, in which the experience of the world has been securely funded. If the individual trusts in his own experience alone, he is but poorly equipped for a life which, if it is to prove efficient, successful and useful, must draw largely from the wisdom of the past as well as that of the present.

Moreover, the training of the student must also be so devised that he will be able to obtain a true vision of values in life. It is only the inner eye of appreciation which is capable of estimating values, of determining what is excellent and what is not excellent; what is worth striving for and what not; what we would fight for and if need be stake our lives to win. Too little effort is put forth in the ordinary course of instruction to stimulate this sense of appreciation. We must endeavor to teach our students not only to see things as they are, but

to see things in their beauty as well. We must not forget that this is a world of appreciation as well as a world of fact. Beauty has a place in our thought as well as utility. This sense of beauty and of right proportion may be fostered by an appropriate training which tends to create a critical judgment and taste. As one of the results of such a training, the experiences of life will naturally range themselves in terms of a series according to their relative importance, first things coming first. In all our thinking and in all our doing we must learn where to put the emphasis. There is a sense of proportion, partly æsthetical, partly ethical which forms the essential basis of culture on the one hand and the fundamental ground both of character and of conduct on the other. This training in value-determination we may leave out of consideration in planning our scheme of studies, and in all our efforts to direct and develop the minds of our students; but if we do we leave them blind to the beauty of nature and of art, depriving them of the deep inner resources of æsthetical appreciation, and render them defenceless when the supreme test comes which is to prove their integrity, their loyalty and their honor.

Our students must also be taught to see themselves in a true relation to the world in which they live and which they are called upon to serve. They must learn to see life in a proper perspective. To be able adequately to estimate one's own powers, to see the world's needs and to appreciate their claims upon us,—this in itself is a call to service. The educated man cannot enter as an excuse for failure to do his duty, the plea that he did not think. It is his business to think. It is, after all, the understanding mind which fires the will and incites the spirit to noble endeavor.

In the training of our young men there must be above everything else an endeavor to direct their minds to see the things which are unseen, which give to them an intimation of a world about them through which they hold a correspondence with the eternal. Such a view of transcendent realities is not due to a

weak credulity or to superstition or to a traditional belief to which we give a formal and indifferent assent, but it finds its rootage deep in the reason which has been purified through doubt and which has been tested by experience, which is able to discern the various lines of thought, of sentiment and of purpose in life, all converging towards a single point, and from that point to discover the secret of seeing Him who is invisible.

The great insight of life which we must endeavor to teach and which our students must learn is that view of things which will constrain them to assume the postulates of God, freedom, and immortality, in their effort to construct a working hypothesis for a life of duty and of devotion. The teacher's prayer may well be that which was offered by the prophet of old: "Lord, I pray thee, open thou the eyes of the young man, that he may see."

PRINCETON, N. J.

VI.

BENEFICIARY EDUCATION IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

(IN TWO PARTS.)

PART II.

OHIO SYNOD.

CLAYTON H. RANCK.

The beginnings at Tiffin are surprisingly parallel to the developments at Mercersburg. In the first report of Professor E. V. Gerhart as professor of theology, in 1853, the need of beneficiary education is most strikingly presented. There were twelve students in the theological department and none of them had been able for lack of funds to pursue a classical course, yet here as elsewhere the aim of those in authority was to have the college work as a necessary part of seminary preparation. The crying need was for funds to maintain the higher standard.¹ Two years later when \$399.02 came into the treasury of the board, it was called the largest annual contribution thus far. The same report records the board's anxiety over the great need of ministers in the Church, the only source being the *institutions*, and since "comparatively few who have a sufficient amount of means at command are willing to devote themselves to the self-denying duties and labors of the ministry, hence we are compelled in order to meet our wants, and fill up the measure of duty assigned us as a church, to furnish the necessary means to those who are not in possession of them, but are willing and anxious to make

¹ Min. of Ohio Sy., 1853, p. 15.

an entire consecration of their time and talents to the Church in the ministry of reconciliation."

They, like their eastern brethren, urged the annual offering in the congregations for the cause.

War times found Ohio synod wanting in ministers although as has been noted it was the one time when the east was over-supplied with them. "Properly considered," says the president of the Board of Education in his report to synod,² "the work of beneficiary education may be regarded as *the most important interest* of the Church at the present day. It is the center from which the other interests and movements of the Church derive their vitality and power. Of what value were the seminary, or the college, or the missionary board, if it were not that by means of the Education Society, the Church is enabled to furnish the men to educate for the missionary and pastoral work. We must not forget that three fourths at least of all that enter the ministry in our Church are such as are assisted in whole, or in part, by this, or some similar society. The board has observed, with great regret, that some brethren who have obtained their education through its assistance, fail to interest themselves in the cause after they enter the ministry, either in obtaining pecuniary contributions to its support, or repaying their loans when able, or seeking out pious young men for the ministry. This should not be so." Yet this was an encouraging season in the matter of receipts, so much so that they called it a year of jubilee, and suggested to synod the propriety of erecting some permanent monument of this revival of benevolence in our beloved Church. The synod had contributed \$1,124.23. A surprising amount for a war year.

The jubilee idea resulted in a movement similar in design to, but more pleasant to tell about than the "Marshall Hall" one at Lancaster which had now become entirely inactive. The building at Tiffin progressed steadily until in 1869 it had reached such a degree of completion that twelve students were living in it. It was known as the "Students' Home" and

² Min. Ohio Sy., 1864, p. 42.

seems from the reports to have done a good work until 1879 when it was sold for the sum of \$7,000 and is now used as a dwelling house. In the following year, 1880, this board was incorporated in order properly to receive certain bequests and appointed a committee to draw up by-laws and rules. Some of the provisions are noteworthy. By these rules men were to promise to return the amount they had received from the board but that one half of general contributions collected could be devoted to their personal indebtedness, and for every year in missionary work, \$50.00 was to be credited. "They were to contract no debts which they have no means to pay, and to indulge in no unnecessary or expensive habits, such as the use of tobacco, buggy or sleigh-riding, frequent attendance upon concerts, and places of amusement, and such things as would not be approved of by at least a very large number of those who contribute the funds with which they are supported." "If anyone should enter the married state, during his course, his appropriation shall cease."

The work in the Ohio Synod was assisted by the American Board for about twice the number of years that aid was given by them to the eastern institutions, but the total number of students helped does not seem to have been as great in the west as in the east.

In 1889³ the obligation to refund moneys advanced was removed, and it was decided that "The beneficiary aid advanced to any student preparing for the gospel ministry under the care of the board is not to be regarded as a loan to be refunded by the recipient but as a cheerful contribution toward the expense of his education."

In 1894 and thereafter aid was given only to such as had finished at least one year's work in college.

The amounts given the students have been on a sliding scale here as elsewhere. In 1897 \$80 was the maximum, which was raised to \$90 in 1901, to \$100 in 1907, to \$115 in 1910, to \$125 in 1911, and to \$150 in 1912.

³ Min. of Ohio Sy., pp. 47 and 70.

This synod passed the following very significant action in 1906:⁴

“Aid may be given students from the foreign mission field or for the foreign mission field, if they have been recommended by our foreign missionaries abroad, or by the church at home with the approval of the Foreign Missionary Board, or have come to study in this country by a special invitation given from this board upon the request of other duly recognized Church authorities or missionaries, or pastors on the field from which they come.”

A member of the faculty of the Central Theological Seminary estimates that four or five graduates per year have been receiving such aid, and that while there is a need of a better system, yet the present one has the support of almost everyone expected to be interested in such things.

PITTSBURGH SYNOD.

This synod organized in 1870 has a Board of Education dating from April, 1874. As might well be expected the rules and regulations governing their activities, as well as of the students under their care, were patterned after those of the “Mother Synod” with the additional ruling that moneys for students’ support were not to be forwarded until within ten days of the close of each session, and then only after certificates had been received from the principal or president of such institution “certifying that the student had been in regular attendance” at recitations.

This synod acted to withhold aid to students until they should have reached the sophomore year in 1900,⁵ although subsequent action seems to allow it to members of the freshman class. It granted permission to give aid to a Hungarian student without requiring the usual bond, in 1911.⁶

In 1908, this board had aided sixty-two students, and the maximum sum allowed them is \$200.

⁴ See Minutes of Ohio Synod, 1906, p. 49.

⁵ See Minutes for same year, p. 48.

⁶ See Minutes, p. 67.

SYNOD OF THE POTOMAC.

Activities in this synod began immediately on organization, the reason being, no doubt, that the institutions of the Church had been within her bounds for so many years. In fact the classes of Maryland and Mercersburg seem to have been among the most active from the first. In 1874 Mercersburg classis was supporting eleven students while the annual gift of the synod for the year was more than two thousand dollars.

This synod's relation to her students might well be characterized by the term *academic*. There is neither a halo nor a mincing of words, but facts are met squarely and without apologies, *e. g.*:⁷ "It was *Resolved* That the board will not receive under its care and supervision any student as a beneficiary, whose scholarship grade, after a fair trial, does not according to the system of grading scholarship in Mercersburg College, exceed that styled No. 3, or 'Passable,' and if at any time, the scholarship of a beneficiary should fall to or below the aforesaid grade, he shall be discontinued as such." "*Resolved*, further That he shall be solemnly admonished by the officers of the board to increased diligence and faithfulness in his studies whenever his class grade does not at least equal the average class grade of his particular class."

That this attitude bore fruit as it has done in other denominations is evidenced by the report of the following year which reads, "Your board is happy in being able to state that all the highest grades in the college were given to young men who are students for the holy ministry . . . and . . . that there was no occasion presented for admonishing to increased diligence and faithfulness in study."⁸ The same report shows that the board was very happy in being able to meet all obligations in full with a balance in the treasury, and in the report of the following year it is stated that not a single instance of violation of the conditions of the bonds had occurred.

Until 1899 aid was given to students in any class in college

⁷ See Minutes of Synod of the Potomac, 1877, p. 16.

⁸ See Minutes of the Synod of the Potomac, 1878, pp. 18-19.

but that year it was voted not to give such aid until the student had completed the first year's work.

This synod is the only one which to the best of our knowledge has any action growing out of the adopting of the elective systems of courses in the colleges. It requires that all students under the care of the synod (and I suppose receiving aid from it) must pursue the study of Greek throughout the entire college course.

INTERIOR SYNOD.

The Board of Education of this synod like that of the preceding one dates from the year of organization, 1887. From the first they urged the pastors to preach on the subject and laid an apportionment of five cents per member. Their students received \$90 per annum until 1892 when the maximum was fixed at \$100.

Though a very youthful synod it has the honor of leading in making an apportionment for a student who was not a candidate for the ministry. In this case it was for a lady missionary.

This raises the question for those who are to teach, to nurse, do deaconess work or follow the medical profession on the foreign field. It does not seem to have come up in any of the other synods, but a number of those who are in the closest relation with our work feel that if a case were to arise it would be met in the proper spirit.

THE GERMAN SYNODS.

Because of an inability to read German on the part of the writer this work is told in the words of a member of the faculty of the Mission House, who wrote me as follows:

"From its establishment in 1862 the Mission House, supported by annual contributions from the congregations of the synods to which it belongs, has given free to beneficiaries board and tuition, but for about ten years they have all been required to pay \$20 per annum for tuition and \$10 in contingent fees.

To the best of my knowledge about 240 have been aided in this way up to date (Nov. 19, 1908).

“We require all beneficiaries to pay *all* their expenses (board, tuition, etc.), during the first year, which is a year of probation. They must also present a recommendation from their classis. If they pass, that is, if their standing in grades and character is satisfactory, they are listed as beneficiaries, and are lodged and boarded free of charge; but they are required to sign a bond secured by sureties, and to bind themselves to pay back to the Mission House \$100 for every year they have spent here as beneficiaries, in case they do not complete their course with the Mission House, or in case they leave the Reformed Church before having served it ten years in the ministry. Quite a number of such delinquents have refunded this money, but several whose bonds had not been secured by sureties (this was formerly not required) and whose obligations were only moral, have failed to respond.

“The very life of the German synods depends on this system of beneficiary education for the ministry. All our students spend their vacations in some gainful occupation so as to replenish their pocketbooks and be able to meet their expenses for books, clothing, and other necessities not supplied by the institution. Many are the sons of ministers (or mechanics and farmers) whose meagre salaries would preclude all opportunities of letting their sons study at all, if it were not for this system.”

What does this dry outline of the history of our work tell us? Is the system a colossal failure, a partial success or a complete success? No one can gainsay the fact that it has been the means of helping quite one half of our ministers to a liberal education, and as such it is deserving of a very proper respect. That many unwarranted slurs and sneers have been cast at those who were so aided is also true, for there are many persons who would congratulate a young man who had received an appointment to Annapolis or West Point, where he is to receive entire support, who will speak unkindly when they hear that he

has accepted aid from the Church. The odium does not seem to be in the receiving of aid, but in getting it without the proper stimulus. The army or navy man must pass a competitive examination. Where scholarships are granted on the basis of work done the same sense of honor accompanies them.

Now of course no one would suggest that only the men able to make the very highest grades are to be thought of for the ministry; too many of us belong to the great majority. But on the other hand, no one test of self discipline equals that of the grades men are able to make, although admitting that that is not an accurate one by any manner of means. When we remember that in none of our synods is the amount given to a student sufficient to meet his needs apart from other sources of revenue, is there not a word to be said for graded amounts on the basis of scholarship? If a man is to get \$150 or \$200 regardless of his class standing, a much smaller sum than that given at Heidelberg in the early days of Protestantism,⁹ and he must get the other funds as best he can, it is obvious that he must spend some very valuable time getting the other funds. There could be no better investment made by the Church than such as would enable him to use that time in getting his class work done better, and to induce him to leave the other work. Graded apportionments have been found successful in a number of instances.

But when we speak in favor of aid granted without such conditions we ought to know that we are not supported by our best educators. They see in it a moral weakness. President Hadley of Yale in his inaugural address said: "We need not so much an increase in beneficiary funds as an increase of opportunities for students to earn their living. Aid in education, if given without exacting a corresponding return, becomes demoralizing. If it is earned by the student as he goes, it has just the opposite effect." This is clear enough, but the more direct message is from the present president of the Federal Council of Churches, Dean Shailer Mathews:¹⁰ "Who is agit-

⁹ See *Tercentenary Manual*, p. 55.

¹⁰ See *The Church and the Changing Order*, p. 220 sq.

ing the question of ministerial supply? Not pastors, but professors in colleges and theological seminaries and secretaries of Young Men's Christian Associations. Ministers are silent, because they do not want their sons to go into the ministry. At a recent great convention of theological students, only a fraction of nearly five hundred delegates came from ministers' families. Fathers and mothers do not want their sons to be ministers. Individual churches are indifferent. Those with a young man among their membership who is studying for the ministry are the exceptions. Christians of maturity in America, Scotland, England, and Germany do not want to be ministers. They do not see just what the function of the ministry is. In the vast majority of cases, the decision to go into the ministry is made by boys in academies and even before they enter the secondary schools. As a result, one of the largest problems that beset Christian education is how to prevent young fellows from losing their early ambitions during the college or university course. And many such college students are more eager to be married than to be trained for real leadership as ministers!

Too many theological seminaries are failing to send out trained leaders of the church.

In the first place, as a class, they are committed to a commercialized method of offering their students financial aid. How much respect can a strong man have for the ministry when he sees men no poorer and with no poorer prospects than himself offered free tuition and free room rent and an outright gift of two or three hundred dollars a year in cash, if only they will enter some theological seminary. There are sacrifices, indeed, in the ministry, but prophets should not be hired to go to school. Some of our theological seminaries and our educational societies are teaching the ministers of the future the dangerous lesson of ministerial discounts and other forms of sanctified graft. Some, it is to be hoped many, men will rise above such influences, but what sort of social leadership or what call to virile sacrifice can this subsidizing of ministerial

students beget? If seminaries have funds for student aid, why should they not use these funds to pay students for reasonable but actual service to weak churches? If such an arrangement made their students poorer in pocket, it would, nevertheless, leave them richer in self-respect."

Hear what another authority, if he may be called such, speaking neither from the Protestant nor the Roman but from the Hebrew viewpoint, says. This writer makes one of his characters say something which seems to show that perhaps our problem is a very much broader and deeper one than some would think. He says: "But what is to be said of a rich community which recruits its clergy from the lower classes? The method of election by competitive performance, common as it is among poor Dissenters, emphasizes the subjugation of the shepherd of the flock. You catch your ministers young, when they are saturated with suppressed skepticism, and bribe them with small salaries that seem affluence to the sons of poor immigrants. That the ministry is not an honorable profession may be seen from the anxiety of the minister to raise his children in the social scale by bringing them up to some other line of business."¹¹

Some of these statements sound very harsh, for we have been calling some of the difficulties to be met by nice names and others we have refused to face at all. Zangwill's statement is very slightly if at all more stinging than some of Dr. Nevin's, and Mathews's reference to the matter of having a boy in secondary years choose his vocation and then hold him to it is quite understated. To me that is a moral issue. College life in many instances is shorn of much of its value because the man is not free to choose. Thwing says: "Not a few (students) enter (college) with a definite idea of their life's calling. It doubtless in certain cases may be well to have a definite idea of one's future vocation. For definiteness of ideas promotes celerity of endeavor. But such definite con-

¹¹ See Zangwill's *Children of the Ghetto*, p. 332.

ceptions usually prove to be false. I have known many cases in which boys came to college with definite ideas of becoming ministers, doctors, lawyers, engineers. The intending ministers usually became engineers and the engineers, ministers.¹² To do anything to interfere with such choices in the light of better knowledge acquired by college opportunities, is certainly an immoral process, and while we may hold some of the weaker men who cannot see their way out financially, we must work an evil in the end. That men who find that they have made another choice owe a debt to the church which is supporting them is of course true, and so the problem is a knotty one indeed.

We may say then that our own history encourages us to continue to use the system now in vogue; but that the work done by other churches would suggest graduated amounts to be apportioned on the basis of scholarship or outside work, in the form of some definite service. But there is a third field, suggested by the others perhaps. We can learn some very definite things from a study of college life today. Several years ago the writer became interested in the matter of self-help in college, and that an unbiased view might be had he wrote to the presidents of the senior classes of sixty colleges and universities asking the following questions: “(1) What percentage of the students in your institution, in your opinion, earn either the whole or a part of their expenses? (2) What do they find to do? (3) What would you advise a young man or woman finding such a course necessary but desiring to enter your institutions?”

Of course the answers were interesting. It is noteworthy that more than two thirds answered the questions. Many consulted with faculty members before doing so, but all with one accord said “Come.”

If any of the readers desire a full report of that study, they can find it in *Education*, March, 1911, pp. 444-448, but a few observations may not be amiss here.

¹² See *Independent*, September 17, 1908, p. 635.

1. From the answers given by these students, not less than thirty-five per cent. of the students in the institutions represented, are helping to earn their way through. And that does not take into consideration the great numbers who are engaged in some remunerative work in the summer months. There was no perceptible advantage in favor of the larger institutions or of those located in cities, except for entire self-support.

2. They speak for the moral helpfulness of such work, if a man is fully prepared, but say also that it is a bad use of time, or rather an unfortunate missing of the best opportunities most men will ever have, if too much time during college years must be given to outside things.

3. Most of the institutions have well-organized bureaus, boards or committees of self-help in charge either of a students' committee, the Young Men's Christian Association, or the faculty or a combination of these, the extent of whose labors in some instances is simply marvelous.

4. College men and women can do anything that anyone else can do, and what is more to the point they do it too.

On one situation we have not touched. The small number of ministerial candidates recruited from the cities. This is a very stubborn fact and is all the more so since so many social service workers are coming to see the larger and larger place the church must take in the redemption of the city, and not a few of them now wish they had entered the ministry. Why this contradiction? It is one of vision. When we have thought through our theory that all callings are sacred ones, we find that instead of the church suffering because of the new standardization of values, she gets her true place and that where apologetic thinking and talking will never place her. Then her ministry will come. Some of us who are country boys expect a new church life when city bred and trained men are in the saddles in city churches as they should be, and a census of any city's ministry will show that they are not there now.

The new minister will choose from a very large variety of courses of work, but he will prepare himself for the most part.¹³ Day and night school facilities are coming for all lines of work, although there is a very amusing opposition to this real democracy in education, and that from sources from which we might well expect better things.

Note.—The writer regrets that this study could not record the work of the several classes, but the necessary minutes are not accessible.

¹³ Our denomination has five undergraduate students at the Johns Hopkins University who are at the same time serving congregations.

BALTIMORE, MD.

VII.

A NEW EPOCH.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

It has been the custom of writers of history to divide their record of the world's progress into certain great periods and to speak of Ancient, Mediæval and Modern History. At present, we seem to stand at the beginning of a new epoch, marked off from the past, by fully as great a chasm as divided any of the two periods of the past. The development of civilization came first in the countries of Egypt and Mesopotamia and we recognize a new set of conditions, when the center of our interest shifts from the river valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile to the broader waters of the Mediterranean and the freer air of Greece and Rome. With the downfall of Roman dominion and the rise of the northern nations, a third set of conditions is seen to environ the world's civilization, and, with the discovery of America, the center of interest shifts from the center of Europe towards the Atlantic ocean, and "westward the star of empire takes its way." Between the years 1890 and 1910, a fifth set of conditions has arisen and the results have appeared of causes that long have been at work.

It is worth while to set down a few of the considerations that lead one to believe that the historian of the future will say that the epoch, which we have long termed modern history, came to an end with the score of years to which reference has just been made and to name these considerations, in no strict logical order of importance, but rather as they occurred to the writer.

We witness a world wide spirit of unrest, a feeling that change is inevitable and desirable in government and in social life, a feeling that often misleads men into the belief that motion is progress and that the heritage of the past should be thrown

away, in far too large a measure. The justification of that restlessness is found in the fact that old things have passed away and that, in a sense that has not been true for four centuries, the world has changed.

First of all, we know the world as it was never known before. The legend, "unexplored territory," has disappeared from the atlases. A Livingstone can no more be lost in "Darkest Africa"; Tibet no longer remains "the mysterious"; Korea is no longer a hermit, nor indeed a kingdom; the poles have been visited; and for discoveries only small and relatively unimportant areas remain to be traversed. We can speak in world terms, we dare to discuss a project of a millionth map of the globe, and we consider the inventory of the resources of the whole earth.

Not only has the whole world become known, but it has practically become included in the same political system. The family of nations, governed by an international law, had always been composed, exclusively, of Christian states, until the beginning of the twentieth century saw the admission of Japan, a non-Christian nation, into that family. Nearly synchronous with this, came the summoning of the first Hague conference, with its sequel in the establishment of tribunals to adjudicate disputes between nations. This fact was startling enough, but the downfall of anti-Christian powers has also shown the end of a great era. There is now no country whither the Christian missionary may not penetrate and where he may not preach. This process found its completion when the president of the new republic of China asked the prayers of all the Christian churches of that nation for the success of the government and when, in the last crusade, the allied Balkan states hurled their forces with instant success against the Turkish armies in Macedonia and Thrace. Africa has been parcelled out among Christian races. Persia is in a semi-vassalage to Russia and England. Siam gives free entrance to Christianity. There is no longer a single important anti-Christian nation.

In the international relations, two other startling facts stand

out in the history of this memorable score of years. The first of these is the appearance of great non-European powers in the world politics. Up to the time of the entrance of the United States into the affairs of the European states, by the declaration of war with Spain, the annexation of the Philippines, and the proclamation of the open door in Chinese affairs by Secretary Hay, the great powers were all European. Then a great American power pressed its way into recognition and the victory of Japan over Russia forced the European powers to recognize a great Asiatic power also. The second fact was the change of the balance of interest from the Atlantic, where it had lain since the discovery of America, to the Pacific, which now is especially regarded as the center of future development, a development thought likely to become the more rapid, when the Panama canal will second the Suez canal in making access to that ocean an easy one. Turning to another field, the period in question closed a most marvellous development of methods of transportation. In 1800, one could go from one place to another with scarcely more speed than in the beginning of the Christian era. The nineteenth century saw, in rapid succession, the perfecting of the steam railroad, the steamboat, the electric telegraph, the telephone, the motor boat, the automobile, the submarine boat and the final conquest of the air by invention of the wireless telegraph, the dirigible balloon, and the aeroplane. There are no more worlds to conquer in transportation and future invention must devote itself to perfecting the details of those means of communication, whose principles have already been discovered. In many other lines, the scientific discoveries of the nineteenth century were so stupendous that they changed the whole current of human thought, and although it is too early to pronounce definitely upon the subject, there are certain signs, which seem to point to the conclusion, that the great era of scientific discovery has come to an end, as the eras of Greek art, of Roman law, of the Elizabethan drama, did previously. It seems probable that, in many fields of science and technology, the immediate future

will see the perfection and elaboration of detail, rather than the elucidation of new principles.

There is another way in which the life of the future will be far different than that of the past. The rise of the corporation is peculiarly characteristic of the nineteenth century and the organization of corporations has now reached such completeness that most of the large business affairs of the world are conducted by them, and the management of them, or the direction of a part of their activities, is likely to occupy much of the time and attention of the men of ability throughout the years of the future. This development of corporations has led to a remarkable change in the character of men's wealth, the consequences of which change are peculiarly multiform and far reaching and will not be completely realized for many years. From the beginning of the acquisition of wealth by mankind in settled communities to the latter part of the nineteenth century, the bulk of man's wealth lay in landed property. So completely was that the case, for example, in English law that the methods of transferring land or real property from one to another were different from and more formal than the methods of changing the ownership of other, or personal, property. Now, however, there has arisen a class of men of great power, because of their great wealth, who yet possess but little land and whose wealth consists in those evidences of a partial ownership of corporations, which evidences we call stocks and bonds. A man may be a multi-millionaire and have a safe deposit box which contains nearly all that which he calls his wealth.

In this rapid survey, no attempt is made to prophesy as to what the characteristics of the future epoch will be, or what we may expect as the forthcoming results of the changes to which we have alluded. Rather has the writer's intention been to point out the great gulf between the life of the world which our fathers knew and which many of us knew in our earlier years and that new life which has come upon us, in the midst of which we live, and in conformity with which will be shaped the life of the years to come.

If this is the beginning of a new epoch and the world is entering upon a new phase of its history, it is surely worth while to take stock of the achievements of mankind to the present and to see what have been the main contributions of the chief historic nations to these achievements. What influences upon the world's history have been so determinative of our past that we should consider them, in a brief survey of the development of the human race?

The birth of civilization seems to have been in Babylonia and there also science and chronology began. In the plains about the lower courses of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, men gazed through a cloudless sky at the stars and, studying the movement of the planets, not only became the first astronomers, but also conceived the idea of the exact division of time. With their observations and the deductions from them, they perceived the fundamentals of scientific method and were the first people to pursue research into the mysteries of the universe.

From Babylonia our eyes turn next to Egypt, whose civilization has always thrilled men. The learning of the Babylonians was long forgotten, but men never lost sight of the fact that from the pyramids forty centuries looked down. The Babylonian structures of sundried brick crumbled, the Egyptian buildings of stone stand perpetually. The valley of the Nile saw the beginnings of a permanent architecture and the wonderful structures of the Greeks were only developments of Egyptian architectural principles.

The learning of Egypt and that of Babylonia were brought northward and westward by the Phœnicians. From Tyre and Sidon set forth those ships of Tarshish, which were destined to carry the products and the culture of one nation to another. The old legend of Cadmus and the Alphabet had the truth in it that a practicable alphabet came to European nations through the intervention of Phœnicians. The excavations in Crete have lately emphasized the importance of the office of those Sidonian merchants. The old narrow and circumscribed

bounds of knowledge widened and the meager equipment of the men of the Mediterranean was increased, when this adventurous race, for the first time, taught the world commercial methods and learned from its trading voyages the rudiments of navigation.

Next in chronological order, we find the Jew, that people with a genius for religion, whose prophets and lawgivers taught them a religion that was ethical, when all other religions were largely of form and ritual, a religion that had no mythology. This religion knew but one God and He was limitless in his being (Jehovah), he was a Holy God. They knew no goddess, nor worship of the powers of generation, which inevitably led to sensuality.

Upon the Jews came down from the north the Ninevites, a fierce race who conceived the idea of empire and the rule over subject peoples in a way that no other people had done. Conquest was made the chief purpose of the state and the measure of its power.

The Ninevite fell before the revived Babylonian empire and that before the Persians, but no new world ideas appear to our view, until the Persians came in contact with the Greeks. Taught by Egyptians and Phœnicians, the Greeks had developed an indigenous civilization and had become the first important European nation. They developed a conception of human life, with a balance of all powers of mind and body—*μηδὲν ἄγαν* was a characteristically Greek phrase. This naturally led them to become the first truly artistic nation and to leave monuments of art, which have never been surpassed for beauty. The very word classic is almost a synonym for Greek. Oriental peoples had not philosophized. It is difficult if not impossible to find a philosophical system in the Old Testament. But the keen power of analysis and the ability to generalize which the Greeks possessed caused them to become the first metaphysicians and to construct the first consistent theories of the universe.

The Greeks, however, lacked what the Romans had, although

the Italian race fell far below them in many respects. "Remember, Rome, to rule the nations" said Virgil and Rome was able to rule, and to establish the first universal empire over the known and civilized world, because of the Roman genius for law and regular order, because of the systematic character of the government, which yet was not bound by the fetish of uniformity. Roman law, truly, lies at the foundation of the Continental systems and this law was of untold value in rounding out and supplementing the legal conceptions and doctrines of the English. The Romans also were great builders and to their skill is due the great architectural discoveries of the arch and the vault, making it possible to construct much larger buildings than formerly.

Into the midst of the Roman world came Jesus, who is called the Messiah, the Christ, a man whose single influence is greater than that of any nation, because he was not alone man but also God. From him sprang the religion whose arch rests on the one hand on the humanity of Christ, on which rise his incarnation into a perfect life and his resurrection, proving his abiding presence and that he was not holden of death, but became the first fruits of them that slept. Thus he brought life and immortality to light through his gospel. The other pillar of the arch, rising upon Christ's godhead, contains his atoning death for sin, revealing the hideousness and gravity of sin and the abounding love of God, and his ascension to the right hand of God, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us. The keystone of the arch is yet to be supplied, for his second coming still tarries. Christ told men of the universal fatherhood of God, the heavenly Father from whom every fatherhood on earth is named, and of the brotherhood of man, there being no difference to him between Jew or Gentile. He showed mankind that God's presence was to be manifested throughout the coming years by the activity of the Holy Spirit.

Down from the north came the Germans, bringing with them a new respect for woman, and an individualism, which followed the lines of the great discovery of Jeremiah that righteousness

was not in its last analysis tribal and which allowed a freer play for each man's inherent characteristics. The Teutonic mind also gave the world something which the Greeks and Romans had failed to find—representative government, which made it possible to have free institutions over a large area. No contribution of any nation has been more valuable than this and it is most melancholy that there have arisen those in these days who would destroy it. A millennium and more passed from the first irruption of the German tribes into the more civilized Roman empire and the northern race contributed again to the world's stock of valuable ideas, by the invention of the process of printing with movable types. The preservation, increase, and diffusion of knowledge has boundless possibilities through the printing press, which was the invention of Germans, whatever may have been their names.

The Arabian contribution was the system of numerals which bears their name, so infinitely more convenient than the clumsy systems of Romans, Greeks or any other nation. In their numeral system, they included the marvellous invention of the zero which made modern arithmetic possible and large calculations feasible.

In northern France a mixed race, whose name, Norman, betokened their Scandinavian ancestry, through their inquisitorial legal system invented trial by jury. They also brought to perfection the pointed arch, making the so-called Gothic architecture, the third of the great modes of building. Crossing the Channel, or the Manche as the French call it, the Normans subjugated the Anglo-Saxons and, from the kingdom of England, peopled by the two fused races of men, came the great conceptions, indispensably necessary for the establishment of constitutional government, that the law is above the rulers, that the king is within the law; and that he governs not according to his own will, but as he is advised by ministers, who are responsible for their advice to the representatives of the people in legislature assembled.

Other European countries have contributed to the stock of

ideas which we possess: In Holland we find the beginning of religious liberty; in France an exactness of form and a vivacity, which leaves nothing uninteresting in its method of presentation; in Belgium, that great invention of the brothers Van Eyck, oil painting, which revolutionized pictorial art. Crossing the ocean we see the contributions of the United States to be the successful establishment of a federal government, a Bundesstaat ruling over a wide territory and the universal adoption of a written constitution, containing a statement of the fundamental rights of the individual citizens and of the chief points in the frame of government and possessing a higher sanction than the acts of an ordinary legislature.

The American Indian must not be forgotten, for modern warfare has learned from him, how to deploy troops in outspread order. The Indians taught the frontiersmen this, they in turn requited Baron Steuben for his training by impressing on him this lesson, and Steuben's tactics were the study of Napoleon.

Japan and China have as yet chiefly affected our art, with an influence which, beginning in Chippendale's chairs, has continued through Whistler's etchings.

The gospel of Christ is monopolistic in its claims. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," said its founder and there is small cause for wonder that, when the gentle influence of its founder was gone, men should have misunderstood these words and that, with Constantine, should have come, what Professor Burr calls the true beginning of the Middle Ages, an ecclesiastical revolution which identified church and state, forced every one to make an outward profession of Christianity, and made it possible for Augustine to write *De Civitate Dei*. This ecclesiastical domination lasted throughout the Middle Ages and was overthrown by that intellectual revolution which we call the renaissance and by that religious revolution which we call the reformation. The eighteenth century saw the invention of the steam engine by the Englishman, Watt, the development of machinery, the establishment of the factory system, the growth

of cities and, toward the close, that political revolution, which, aided by the influence of the American War for Independence, caused the end of the ancien regime in the French Revolution. The nineteenth century saw the vast development of means of transportation; a marvellous increase in comfort; vast advances in preventive medicine and in surgery; as well as, for the first time, a concerted attempt by all Christendom to carry the gospel to every man in every language and thus to evangelize the world. It was, too, a period of nation building, in which the influences of language and supposed unity of race or interest bulked largely in men's mind, and it was a constitutional age, in which arbitrary government was done away and untrammelled rulers disappeared. It was a period of parcelling out the uncivilized nations as possessions to the civilized.

Now we stand in the early years of the twentieth century and, as we ask of the future, we can divine but little. Of these things, I am sure, however, that the times show that the concern of each nation will be for the conservation of its natural resources, the education of all its people, the successful management of questions of world policy, and the reconstruction of its social structure, by a revolution which we hope may be more peaceful than any preceding one.

THE ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY,
BALTIMORE, MD.

VIII.

THE CHURCH'S WORK IN THE WORLD.

HENRY GEKELER.

Paul told the Ephesians that Christ had given himself up for the church that he might present it unto himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. The ideal church and its realization in a work-a-day world is bound to be a subject of only less interest than the person and work of the Savior himself.

1. We begin with this axiom: *The church must affect and influence the entire round of human life.*

The business of the church is religion. Religion is everything or it is nothing. Not all true religion is to be found within the church, but there, if anywhere, we look for it. In what other organization or institution should we so naturally expect to find those whom the Savior called lights of the world. Their work, however, is not to be confined within the church walls, they are lights of the world. He also called them salt. Only as the salt is rubbed in does it preserve, only as it is mingled with food does it give flavor. Where, if not in the church, should we seek the leaven of the gospel? The meal in which it is hid is not the church, but the world. The world is the whole lump that is to be permeated by the leaven. The church exists for the world's sake, not for its own sake. As it loses its life for the world's betterment, it shall find its life. If it saves its life, it shall lose it. What each member of Christ should do in his individual capacity, all the members of the church should do in their corporate capacity. Christ working in them and in it is to effect such a transformation that the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

2. Our second proposition is this: *The church can not do everything, nor even all that men may demand of her.*

The child may insist that every speck of its slice of bread be evenly coated with butter. So we might childishly think that the church should equally distribute her energies over all phases of life. Most of us recognize that in so doing the church would be spreading herself out too thin. Is there nothing for the school to do? Must the church be the sole teacher? Would education be broader and more efficient if every pedagogical policy had to have ecclesiastical sanction? Is there nothing for the state to do? Must the church be state also? Doubtless politics—as well as education—can stand all the inspiration which the church can afford. But the question is, whether politics would be purer if the church became a political party and dictated all civic movements. “Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s and to God the things that are God’s.” That saying is pertinent to this discussion, even when we go deep enough to acknowledge that Cæsar also is a minister of God. The state has functions quite distinct from those of the church. At least under ordinary circumstances and in ordinary conditions we do not help the state or the church by blurring this distinction.

Nor can the church meet all the demands which men impose upon her. Reformers of all kinds would harness up the church’s energies to their pet projects. Whenever we fear that the church is weak and outworn and moribund, comes along a new reformer, the conductor of some new movement, and convinces us that the church is well nigh omnipotent by his anxiety that the church assume responsibility for the new movement or reform or philanthropy. Doubtless it is flattering to the church to receive such appeals, but she should not be bribed by the flattery into undertakings for which she may have only slight competence.

The church is a finite thing, notwithstanding Christ is her head. If the Master himself recognized that for the time being he was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,

may not the church also, without sacrificing her dignity as His church, clearly see that she can not do everything, nor even all that admirers may demand of her, but that among all the good things she could possibly do, *she must choose* just what things she ought to do above all else?

The church is not to spread herself evenly—and thinly—over every phase of human experience; rather is she to distribute herself as an army, massing her forces as a study of the field warrants at points of crucial attack.

Well may the church declare: Nothing that is human do I consider alien to myself. Assuredly, therefore, she should be ready to bear a hand in reforms, philanthropies, education, politics, but she must decide just what she should do and what avoid. She should not do things haphazard; she should not drift, but steer; and then what she does, she should do with all her might. It is the glory of Henry Ward Beecher and of Plymouth church that they thus chose and wrought in the cause of freeing the slave.

3. From the preceding emerges our third proposition: *The church's work will vary according to time and place.*

All places are not alike; environments must be studied. There are communities so young and crude that they could advantageously use methods and devices which older and more advanced societies have cast upon the junk pile. The needs of communities vary. Who would think of conducting a church in America as he would in Africa? There it might be necessary to have physician and nurse quite as much as pastor and teacher. There it might be expedient to conduct a mission with an industrial annex. In such a civilized, but heathen, country as Japan the hospital and shop as adjuncts to a Christian church might be accounted as useless as a grown man's appendix. Are institutional churches desirable? In some places, yes. And where they are desirable, you could not pick up one institutional church bodily and set it down in another neighborhood. For, while both neighborhoods might need institutional churches, each needs the sort of institutionalism best adapted to itself.

Time effects great changes. One age of the great universal Church differs from another, as from all other ages. If the church in any age is a living organism, her vitality will be apparent in the ease with which she correlates herself with her environment, with which she adapts herself to the needs of the time. It would be an anachronism to pattern a modern church on mediæval models. We protestants are as free to acknowledge that as the ordinary man is to confess sin—in another! Is it not also an anachronism for a twentieth century church to imagine that the last word was spoken in the sixteenth century—even though it was the reformation century?

A local congregation may be oppressed by the dead hand of a bygone tradition that has outlived its usefulness. If a congregation is alive, it will establish new precedents as well as follow old ones. True conservatism tries the spirits, if they be of God, utilizes new opportunities by old methods if they are workable, by new methods if they promise greater efficiency. Conservatism is intent on saving, not merely on abiding by what is old and familiar.

The Men and Religion Movement either brought a great blessing or a great curse to the church of our time. Its program was virtually repeated in the work of Home Mission Week as outlined by the United Council of Home Missionary Boards. That same varied program has been absorbed into the policy of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Recall a few of the principles which the Federal Council, in its quadrennial convention in Chicago, hoped that our American churches would make their own. The Council pronounced:

“For the protection of the family by the single standard of purity, uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage, and proper housing.

“For the fullest possible development for every child, especially by the provision of proper education and recreation.

“For the abolition of child labor.

“For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as

shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

“For the abatement and prevention of poverty.

“For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, and occupational diseases and mortality.

“For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

“For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

“For the most equitable division of the product of industry that can ultimately be devised.”

If this series of pronouncements is to become more than paper resolutions, then our churches have surely come to a fork in the road, and we should seriously consider what lies ahead. Presumably the program offered is a flexible one, some of the points fitting some communities better than others. But if any considerable portion of the program is to be striven for, it means creating additional energy for social endeavor. If only we could induce some of the idlers in God's house to enlist in social service! Perchance the program is a challenge whereby we may awake forces that are now, and otherwise will continue to remain, dormant.

The alternative is that the proposed program involves a diversion of the church's effort in the direction of social betterment. Do we want such partial diversion of the church's energies? Whether we want it or not, is God in his providence calling us to look upon other fields that are white unto harvest? The discomfort of being shaken out of customary ruts apart, ought the church to strive more definitely for social regeneration and for a transformation of the environment in which multitudes must live? Shall we insist as a church that there is a moral side to other questions than temperance? Do industrial and economic problems have an ethical aspect? Do we wickedly hold our peace?

4. Our last point is not a proposition, but an interrogation: *What is the church's permanent and abiding work?*

Time and place change problems, and also remedies. New occasions teach new duties. But are not these changes comparatively superficial? If we dig deep enough do we not find a solid, unchanging substratum of abiding need? And in the meeting of these deepest needs is there not work for the church to do of a more permanent and unchangeable sort to which she must constantly give her chief effort?

We believe the church will continue to be the administrator of the holy sacraments and the *conductor of worship*. Prayer and adoration and praise expressed in a social way meet a profound need of the human spirit. Devout souls will still sing of the church, with the elder Timothy Dwight:

“Beyond my highest joy
I prize her heavenly ways,
Her sweet communion, solemn vows,
Her hymns of love and praise.”

The church must still pursue her task of *teaching*. Today when so many are repeating, whether in frivolity or in despair, Pilate's question, “What is truth?” there is need that the church should have convictions and should utter them in trumpet tones. We may not be so certain of all the minute details of a theological system as our fathers were, but the fewer things should be held the more fundamentally and we ought to be able to present them the more convincingly. Men are too largely in a haze as to their views of God. Their ethical views likewise are too indistinct. No so-called social service can be a substitute for the service of teaching the truth. The church must ever be the pillar and ground of the truth. The truth still does and always will make men free. Social workers will do all the better work if they are rooted and grounded in fundamental truth. If the messages of the prophets show anything, they indicate that adequate conceptions of God's character will make us humanitarian. There is no view of human nature that makes it more dignified than that every man is made to be God's child. Neither will any other view make work for man's reclamation and redemption so worthwhile.

The church dare not be diverted from her function of *preaching*. The faith of Peter honestly confessed was the rock upon which Christ would build his church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against her so long as she keeps on, in pulpit and pew, confessing Him to be the divine Redeemer. The church's Christ is the revealer of God and also the revealer of man's nature, but more, He is the omnipotent Savior. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Men need sanitation, but still more do they need salvation. Men need transformed surroundings, but more they need a changed heart whence are the issues of life. Human life is not to be gilded from without, but glorified from within, "Christ in you the hope of glory." He has always been the magnet of the human heart. It will be a dark day for the church and darker still for the world when upon any pretext whatsoever the church ceases preaching the gospel of Christ, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

This is, however, not to be pressed to the extreme of forbidding her influence and activity in the various spheres of social life. In a subordinate way the church must radiate light and warmth in every direction. She is idealist; her work is therefore inspirational.

Dr. Washington Gladden's experience as councilman in Columbus, Ohio, was not all that anticipation had painted. It was no surprise to his friends when he expressed the renewed but old-fashioned conviction that he could do more for the cleaning up of Columbus as a teacher and preacher and pastor than he could as a politician.

Let the church inspire her members to be good citizens, but ordinarily let her as an ecclesiastical body stay out of politics. I believe she will help all good causes best, not by being the direct champion of particular causes, but by furnishing the moral and spiritual impetus which all such causes need.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

IX.

UNIFORMITY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP.

WILLIAM H. ERB.

Public worship must be expressed in some outward form. The order of the tabernacle and the temple services, directed and sanctioned by God, were conducted in prescribed ceremonies; and the public worship of the Christian Church in the days of the Apostles followed necessarily certain forms, which became more and more fixed as the church organization became more established. Some of these forms were undoubtedly borrowed from the temple and synagogue worship. These fixed forms or framework of public worship of the early church were transmitted perhaps orally, from one generation to the other, and became the custom and practice of church worship, an "unwritten liturgy."

Prescribed forms of worship were in general use in the third century. In the fifth century, the church, east and west, was using liturgies or forms, which were strikingly similar, and gave uniformity and a specific characteristic to the Christian Church. This fact gave a certain power to the Church and impressed itself upon the pagan world. It was a manifestation of the unity of the Church, which is one of the duties of Christ's disciples. It was for this that Christ prayed. "There is a unity to be believed in, as well as a unity to be exhibited to the world. It is essential to realize that the interior unity of the Church is a divine, imperishable reality, and that our task is not to make unity, but to make it manifest."

Life must express itself in forms corresponding to its nature. The seed after its kind is the law of the nature of life. The life of the Church must manifest itself in some visible forms,

by which the Church as the body of Christ expresses her relation to Christ, the head. As the soul of the worshipper is permeated and influenced by the life and spirit of the Church, does the soul in public worship especially, and also to some degree in private devotion, employ forms to express its corresponding conception.

Every denomination, as a part of the Holy Catholic Church, is filled with the life and the spirit of the Church, but at the same time has a distinct denominational viewpoint. This denominational distinction and spirit must accordingly manifest itself by some visible form or sign, especially so in her divine public services. Sects have their forms or outline of worship, modified according to their sectarian viewpoint and conception. Even under the disorder in their service, there may be discovered an outline in harmony with the life and spirit of the sect. This uniformity of commotion and so-called freedom of worship creates and strengthens sectarian spirit and life, and is regarded by the members as spirituality and true worship.

The churchly and more established denominations are more orderly and formal in their public worship. They have grown in grace and knowledge. There is less rant and confusion: and their expression of devotion in public worship is more dignified without losing necessarily the sincerity and the spirituality. This denominational culture and growth is, or at least should be, manifest in the order and forms of service. A denomination, therefore, because of the sameness of spirit and doctrine should express the fact by uniformity of public worship. The more evident and pronounced the unity of the churches in spirit becomes, the more uniform will be the outward manifestation of this unity in her public worship. There is a tendency in the church universal toward a uniformity of worship, because of the ever growing sense of church unity and union. This unity in spirit should certainly be most pronounced in a denomination. We have a right to look not only for unity of spirit in a denomination, but also for a unity of

life, of theological conception, and of mission. Consequently we have a right to expect a uniformity of expression of the said unity in her public worship. If a denomination lacks in such a uniformity of order, the unity of spirit and of life is weak and unhealthy.

If a denomination has a reason to exist as a separate organized body of the Church universal, she must possess a distinct denominational spirit and life; and if she is to fulfill a distinct mission as a denomination, she must endeavor to create, cultivate, and bring prominently to the surface her denominational unity of that spirit and life. Without such a qualification and effort, a denomination cannot be a great factor in bringing about the union of Christendom. It is fatal to the cause to think and so to labor that the union of the churches of Christ can be effected best by neglecting or ignoring the unity of the denominational spirit and life. Such indifference will work the opposite, and result in separation and independency, foster the sect spirit and schism, and hinder the fulfillment of our Savior's prayer for the unity of his followers.

Has our denomination, the Reformed Church, attained, and does she manifest such a convincing unity in spirit and in life, as to be distinguished as a distinct denomination? If we are to judge our inner unity of spirit and life by our outward expression in public worship, we must confess that we as a denomination somewhere and somehow woefully lack denominational unity. This conclusion is impressed upon the public mind. Our latitude of churchly expression and liberality of theological thinking, of which we at times boast and are proud, are not, as it may appear at first thought, conducive to the unity of the Church in spirit, nor to organic union of closely allied denominations; but are obstacles preventing success, because they tend toward disintegration of denominational union and life. Such ecclesiastical freedom in thought and in forms of worship makes a denomination congregational in fact, if not in name, loosely compact, easily shaken, handicapped in her undertakings, because of the spirit of independency.

Thoughtful and observing men are impressed and surprised with the many contradictory and confusing variety of forms of public worship found in our denomination. The condition is alarming, portending an unsettled state. Ordained servants of the Lord feel at times as lost and strange in the pulpit of a brother minister, as if they were in a pulpit of another denomination, constantly fearful of making blunders, not knowing when to sing or when to pray. In fact there are pulpits where a minister feels more at home and in accord with that denominational atmosphere than in his own mother church. The laity cannot always distinguish the Reformed Church by her order of worship. They feel like strangers in their own spiritual household. Often even neighboring congregations so differ in their order and forms of worship, that they seem to belong to widely separated denominations theologically.

Should this be so or should it not be so? If there is unity of spirit and of life, it cannot be so. Since it is so, we must conclude that our church lacks the oneness of denominational life and spirit. We are not vitally united. Instead, therefore, of striving for organic union with allied denominations, our first mission and duty are to create and manifest denominational unity and union. There may be various agencies to accomplish this, and one of these is uniformity of church worship. The lack or the ignoring of this specific agency is detrimental to life and power of any denomination; and has been, and is, one of the shortcomings of our beloved Zion.

Uniformity of worship on the one hand is the result of denominational unity and union, and on the other hand it is the necessary environment conducive to the growth of that unity. Regular and uniform order of service has a greater influence and power in creating the spirit and life of a denomination than a system of theology. The prayer book of the Episcopal Church has done more to make that denomination distinct than her doctrines. Regular and uniform order of worship, expressing the life and spirit of the Church and of the particular denomination, is a power in making the laity devout and wor-

shipful, and in keeping them in sound doctrine and faith of the Church, because it is the outward expression of the Church and denominational life and spirit in the soul of the worshipper, planted there by the teaching of the gospel according to the viewpoint and conception of the denomination.

Ministers, because of the freedom of our denomination (or rather laxity) with reference to the order of public worship, formulate their own outline or framework for public service. These forms are arranged frequently in accordance to personal ideas and fancy, or æsthetical promptings, regardless to church and denominational life. Since there are always two tendencies in the church catholic, namely high and low, so-called, the extremes of these two tendencies are being expressed in a confusing variety of forms, modified by environments, training, and personal disposition of the author. Our denomination consequently suffers, fails to stand for something distinct in the eyes of the world, and does not develop into a strong unit of coöperative force. She fails to acquire that denominational life, spirit and unity which rightly belong to her.

The effort made in the past to give our denomination an order of service brought about, it is true, an unpleasant controversy; but the very extent and acrimony of that controversy reveal the weakness of our denominational unity and the diversity of our viewpoint and formal expression of church life. The dispute was not so much upon the question of form or no form, but upon the expression of that form. All recognized the fact that our church life should be expressed in some form of public worship. There was then, as is now, many differing and independent orders of service, borrowed from other denominations, inherited from the past, or manufactured by the pastor, but none that expressed the denominational life and unity satisfactorily, or had been adopted and authorized by the church. The two liturgies, the directory and the order, have been used since by a part of our church, but frequently so modified, altered, added to or taken from, that in many instances they are no more recognizable.

That controversy, although bitter and unpleasant, has been overruled by Providence for some good, and has revealed to the church her lack of unity of denominational spirit and life. These two liturgies have been a factor in arousing the various tendencies of our denomination to the fact that our denominational life and spirit must be expressed in a corresponding formal order of worship. Wherever the directory or the order is used unaltered and as recommended or permitted by the church authorities, they have checked the two tendencies, the so-called high and low, and have kept the congregations evangelical and churchly. Our denomination has grown in grace and in knowledge during the last fifty years; the denominational spirit and unity have been developed, and this unity could be made to blossom like a rose in June, if given the proper cultivation and environment. To accomplish this there must be more uniformity in our church services, so that wherever we go the Reformed Church services are the same or so similar as to leave no doubt of the sameness of life and spirit. This would give a distinct denominational atmosphere, conducive to our church life.

Variety is not always the sign of life, neither is uniformity the sign of lifelessness, as some contend. Uniformity is not destructive, but rather constructive. Variety may be simply confusion and end in chaos, and uniformity may be dignity and create solemnity. Uniformity is a sign of union, which is strength, and by union as in grafting is created life and unity. Yet the seasons of the church year would afford themes for a variety of forms of public worship, proving instructive as well as devotional, preventing a lifeless sameness or routine. These various forms corresponding to the seasons of the church year would be used at the same time and in the same way throughout the church, manifesting a unity of our church and denominational life and spirit. Thus the Reformed Church might be recognized as the Reformed Church anywhere and everywhere, expressing a sameness of life by her uniformity of public worship.

BETHLEHEM, PA.

X.

THE RATIONALE OF TEMPERANCE.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

It is the fate of certain words to suffer such perversion as to lose entirely—in a given application, at least,—their original significance. This is either the result of a slovenly method of thought, which fails habitually to appraise intellectual values, or it may be due to simple ignorance of or inattention to the etymology of the words in question. By way of illustration, let us consider the words that have their common root in *temper*—viz., *temperance*, *temperate*, and, incidentally, *temperament*.

If the word *temper* be examined, it will be found to denote an activity or quality which is inherently and invariably good. Traced back to its Latin original, *temperare*, it means “to mingle in due proportion, qualify, regulate, rule,” and, intransitively, “to observe measure, be moderate.” In present-day use, when correctly employed, it means “to combine in due proportion, to modify by mixing, to blend”; hence, “to restrain, moderate, mitigate, tone down the violence, severity, or harshness of.”

As a perfect example of temper, the ancient Toledo blade may be named. Here was a piece of metal, so keen and strong that the stoutest joints might be by it unknit, and yet, so exquisitely tempered as to permit of being bent back upon itself without breaking. With this example in mind, as a norm, we can the better estimate that vulgar conception of the word which finds utterance in such a phrase as this, in deprecation of some unhappy friend’s irascibility: “What a temper he has got!” To have a temper is, really, to be *temperate*—to be

strong, self-controlled, and yet so flexible as not to snap under the severest strain.

Of late, a tendency has appeared to treat the word *temperament* in the same unthinking way. A young woman, for example, is said to have "temperament" when she exhibits a marked individualism, an abhorrence of conventionality, and an excess of certain qualities which, only when blended with others in harmonious and even proportion, can go to the making of a temperament, in the true sense of the word.

But most of all, when we come to consider the words *temperance* and *temperate*, shall we encounter a ruthless disregard of linguistic truth. *Temperance*, according to the "Century Dictionary," is "habitual moderation in regard to the indulgence of the natural appetites and passions; restrained or moderate indulgence; abstinence from all violence or excess, or from the use or pursuit of anything injurious to moral or physical well-being; sobriety, frugality: that is, *temperance* in eating and drinking; *temperance* in the indulgence of joy or grief."

Could anything be farther from the actual and implied meaning of the word than the use to which it is now so commonly put? When we read of the "Temperance Cause" and its propaganda, or hear a "Temperance Lecture," or, if in England, have the temerity to stay at a "Temperance Hotel" and abuse our stomach with "Temperance Drinks"—we are in a position to appreciate how a good word has been degraded through the zeal of misguided devotees. This unfortunate word has been limited, in its application, to the use of alcoholic liquors as beverages, and then it has been still further narrowed down to total abstinence from such liquors. When a man complacently says: "I am temperance; I never touch a drop," he is, obviously, unaware of the absurd paradox to which he gives such impressive utterance. How can one lay claim to temperance when one does not use the thing in question at all?

Besides, it is only uttering a truism to say that the word

temperance applies equally to all the functions and activities of every-day life: to eating, smoking, coffee- and tea-drinking, speech, pleasure, recreation, money-making, and even work. He is not the temperate man who abstains totally, for fear of excess; nor yet again, who is abstemious in meat and drink, but self-indulgent in the matter of work. Temperance is a quality which determines the very fiber of the man. He is temperate because he is well tempered.

In March, 1781, Boswell writes of his hero: "Everything about his character and manners was forcible and violent; there was never any moderation; many a day did he fast, many a day did he refrain from wine; but when he did eat, it was voraciously; when he did drink wine, it was copiously. He could practice abstinence, but not temperance." With that pen-picture before us, reënforced by legends of tea-drinking feats, we are prepared for other chronicles of gouty humors, irritability, and brow-beating pugnacity. We know that the great Doctor Johnson was not, by nature, proclivities, or training, a temperate man. Abstinence he could practice, on occasion; temperance was wholly foreign to his nature.

In Macaulay's *Conversations between Cowley and Milton* occurs this significant saying: "If he be insatiable in plunder and revenge, shall we pass it by because in meat and drink he is temperate?" How apposite to our own day and generation? Many a man there is, surely, in our circle of acquaintance, temperate in meat and drink, but in his lust for gain, insatiable; arrogating to himself much virtue, and winning from his fellows much praise for rigid self-control, and yet, totally unread, it would seem, in the "weightier matters of the law": justice, mercy, and respect for the rights of others—that instinct of fair play, in short, which forbids a man willingly to wrong his neighbor.

Waiving, for the present, the broad signification of the word, let us consider certain aspects of the so-called "Temperance Problem"—a problem which we seem always to have with us, in America. Many and divergent are the races which meet

upon our soil, and titanic is the struggle which here goes on between them. It is a struggle, not so much for racial as for industrial and economic supremacy; and yet, in this struggle inevitably emerge certain racial traits which are the heritage of unnumbered generations, in the lands where these several races have had their homes. The question as to which of these racial characteristics shall, in the long run, prevail, is an interesting one.

It is a notorious and yet curious fact that, among European nations, the drink problem is confined to the north. In the south, there is no such problem. It is only in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Scandinavia, in Russia, and, to a less appreciable degree, in Holland, Belgium, and a limited portion of France, that the popular use of alcoholic liquors assumes the proportions of a problem. The people of the south are temperate, in the true and convincing way. Drink is everywhere to be had; it is used every day; and yet rarely, very rarely, does a man disgrace himself by using it to excess. It is a humanizing spectacle to see the modern Athenians sitting in crowds of an afternoon, at the open-air cafés, each man with his modicum of drink before him, but so simple in quality and slight in quantity that a northerner would blush to be seen with it.

“Nothing too much” was the inspiring motto of the ancient Greeks, exemplified for all time in Doric architecture, in the marbles of Phidias and Praxiteles, in the philosophy of Plato, in the dramas of Æschylus and Sophocles. On the Acropolis, in the “Hermes” at Olympia, in the *Republic*, the *Antigone*, and the *Œdipus*, these Greeks of antiquity embodied, in forms of undying beauty, the animating spirit of dignity, of simplicity, of restraint,—in a word, of *temperance*.

Their descendants of to-day, though in many ways sadly decadent, are yet, in certain particulars, worthy of their illustrious ancestry. They are simple, frugal, self-contained, self-respecting, proud, and, in the matter of drink, the most temperate of people.

So, likewise, the Italians. In a land where wine may be said to flow like water—to take, indeed, the place of water—over-indulgence is extremely rare, and drunkenness, practically unknown. Never in the south and once only in the north have I seen a man who showed signs of inebriety, and the summary treatment he received I shall never forget. It was in the *Piazza San Marco* at Venice, during the festivities incident to the opening of the new Campanile. The city was in gala attire and the inhabitants were wrought up to a high pitch of civic enthusiasm. A visitor, apparently from some near-by town, had been tempted to celebrate the unusual occasion by unusually liberal potations. He was a respectable-looking man, decently dressed and quiet in his manner; but when he presumed to join a group of men sitting round a little table before one of the cafés, and endeavored to engage them in conversation, he was at first ignored and then sharply snubbed. Too befuddled to appreciate the situation, he persisted in his friendly overtures. Without more ado, a waiter was summoned, who, in turn, called an officer, and the poor man, earnestly protesting but offering no resistance, was led away in disgrace. A better illustration of the attitude of the average Italian toward drunkenness could not be desired. In marked contrast to the good-humored toleration or kind-hearted pity with which Americans are wont, under similar circumstances, to treat an unfortunate brother, was the frank disgust, the quick resentment shown by these Italians, when confronted by this, to them, unpardonable offense.

In Spain, again, a country renowned for the abundance and excellence of its wines, one sees no evidence of the abuse of nature's bounty. In Provence, too, land of the gay troubadour, where the wine is rich and red and the men are given to mirth and song, excess in drinking seems quite unknown. Often have I watched the common soldiers from the barracks in Avignon, sitting in groups of four, six, or eight, around the café tables, each man with his glass before him, and never an obscene word, a ribald jest, or a sign of beastly excess. When

I have seen them thus, I have never failed to marvel at their temperance, and to honor them for a certain fineness of fiber which, in northerners of similar station and calling, seems often sadly lacking.

The French peasant, throughout the length and breadth of the land, is a sober, thrifty man, endowed with many virtues and deserving of sincere admiration. The Parisian, to be sure, is not commonly accepted as a model of "quietness, sobriety, and peace"; and yet even he, when not diverting himself by shocking unattached spinsters or catering to prurient, middle-aged males from across Channel or over-sea—even he is, in the main, a serious enough personage, simple in his tastes, temperate in his pleasures, leading a normal, wholesome life, nicely balanced between work and play.

Indeed, I know no province of France, outside of Brittany, where one may see open, downright drunkenness. Here, however, if the truth must be told, it does exist in a brutal and revolting form. But these Breton fishermen, let it be remembered, are not French; they are Celts—first cousins of the whiskey-drinking Gaels of Britain,—and it is not the red wine of France that works their undoing; it is a fiery brandy, a craving for which is induced, it would seem, by their life of hardship and exposure. The Germans, finally, with all their beer-drinking, remain an essentially temperate people, among whom drunkenness is severely stigmatized, and, as a matter of fact, quite unusual.

It is not until one comes to cross the Channel into Britain, or the German Ocean into Scandinavia, or invades the vast empire of Russia, that one is confronted by marked intemperance, and, only too often, by inhuman drunkenness. Here, for the first time, one sees blotched and bloated faces, bleared eyes, and hard, hopeless, degraded poverty. Here, for the first, one is confronted by the drink problem, hears of the "Gothenburg System," "High License," and other remedial measures. The people of these northern countries are grosser in their tastes and more unrestrained in indulging them. In place of

wine and beer, temperately used as food, they demand whiskey, ale, raw spirits, and *vodka*—all strongly alcoholic and consumed intemperately to allay an abnormal craving for stimulation. When one sees a Swede of Stockholm toss off his glass of spirits (*brännvin*), preparatory to dining, in order to create an artificial appetite, one can account for his huge paunch, bovine neck, and flabby, pendulous skin.

Why the people of the north are more intemperate than the people of the south is a question for anthropology, sociology, and psychology, between them, to decide. The fact is indisputable; the causes are, doubtless, complex and various. The elements of climate and racial temperament do not, of themselves, account for existing phenomena.

In the United States of America the several races of Europe have found, for generations, a second home. Here the people of the north have met, on common ground, the people of the south, and here they are slowly amalgamating to form a new society. Between parallels of latitude 25 and 50, and of longitude 65 and 125, there is, obviously, a considerable range of climate. Given these conditions of race and climate, what outcome, in the matter of temperance, should we be led to expect? Our climate, we are told, is prohibitive rather than permissive of indulgence in alcoholic liquors. But where do our people stand—heterogeneous as they are, in race and temperament? Have they ranged themselves with the dwellers in the north, or with the natives of the south, or—what is more likely to be the case—is the northern tendency to over-indulgence so tempered by the southern tendency to moderation, as to produce a truly temperate race? *A priori* reasoning might lead us to some such charming conclusion. How far wide of the truth it would be, any one who will look at actual conditions well knows.

The fact is only too palpable that, with the Anglo-Saxon tongue and laws and political institutions, we have adopted, likewise, the Anglo-Saxon, or typically northern, attitude toward drink. With humility let us own, that in the use of

wine or beer or alcoholic liquors of any kind we know nothing of that golden mean, that humane temperance, which is the distinction and the glory of southern peoples. The drink problem we have ever with us, and, what is more, we seem to recognize but one way of meeting it: total abstinence for the individual, prohibition by law for the mass. That the drink evil may be extirpated—root, stock, and branch—by legislative enactment is the fond and, be it granted, sincere belief of a host of well-meaning men. Prohibit, absolutely, the sale of the accursed thing, and the desired end is forthwith achieved. Permit the so-called “Temperance Party” to have their way, and we shall see a whole people, willy-nilly, made temperate. A colossal fallacy, an unjustifiable assumption of moral prerogative, this must seem to anyone who has observed and pondered among the peoples of Europe.

Temperance, in the true sense of the word, cannot be imposed by extraneous prohibition or limitation of any kind. It is a moral attribute; it is the temper of the man appearing in his attitude toward drink, as toward other things; it is the very fiber of the man revealed in this as in all his moral and social activities. If temperance is to become to him a vital possession, it must be by him deliberately and consciously exercised. How this may be done, who but the man himself shall say? If, however, he would seek a shining example; if he would contemplate happy results, let him live for a season among the peoples of southern Europe and—if he be teachable—learn of their ways and be wise. If, on the other hand, he would know, by equally striking example, what to avoid, let him study existing conditions in any country of northern Europe. Temperance he will then perceive to be the simple, everyday exercise of moral choice—as free and unhampered as it is unafraid, humane, and rational.

LANCASTER, PA.

XI.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

BY A. V. HIESTER.

Among the utopias of the second half of the nineteenth century the finest and most widely known representative of anarchism, particularly communistic anarchism, as a scheme of social reconstruction, is Morris's *News from Nowhere*. It has been pronounced the finest utopia since that of Sir Thomas More in the sixteenth century. Its author, William Morris (1834–1896), was an English poet and artist. He was educated at Oxford having matriculated at Exeter College with the design of taking holy orders. But he had not been at Oxford long before he came to the conclusion that there was more to be done along the line of social reform than in the field of strictly religious work. Recognizing the beneficent influence of art in the social life of a people he decided to be an architect. For a time he combined painting with architecture, but later, on the advice of a friend who thought him better fitted for painting, he devoted himself exclusively to that branch of art. His marriage and the building of a home, which, with its furnishings, decorations, household utensils and every article of daily use, was specially designed by himself, led him into the field of decorative art as a life career. With some friends he formed a company to undertake church decorations, carving, stained glass, metal work, paper hangings, chintzes and carpets. To these arts he added later fine printing.

As an artist Morris is essentially the child of the Gothic revival. The spirit of medievalism breathes through all his work. He exercised an extraordinary influence upon English contemporary art, putting "an ineffaceable stamp on Victorian

ornament and design," and founding a school "dominated by his protest against commercialism and his assertion of the necessity for natural decoration and pure color, produced by hand-work and inspired by a passion for beauty, irrespective of cheapness or quickness of manufacture."

Without a rival in his chosen field of art he was scarcely less eminent in the domain of letters. He is universally ranked with the greatest English writers of the nineteenth century. Poetry he cultivated from his Oxford days to his death. In 1858, when only twenty-four years of age, he published his first volume of poems under the title, *The Defence of Guenevere and Other Poems*, which, while it attracted little attention at the time, is now recognized as one of the pearls of Victorian poetry. This was followed by many other volumes. While he wrote a number of prose romances he was above all else a story-teller in verse. His poetry is marked, not only by a lofty sentiment of romance, but also by a "sense of pure beauty in nature and life, the melancholy strain of a dreamer of dreams born out of his due time, and a taking refuge in an idealized golden age of the past from a vain effort to 'set the crooked straight.' " Besides his original romances in prose and verse, which may almost be said to have enriched English literature with a new form of composition, he made many translations, including a large collection of Icelandic sagas, as well as the *Aeneid*, the *Odyssey* and *Beowulf*.

That his eminence as a poet did not pass unrecognized among his contemporaries may be seen from the fact that he was offered the professorship of poetry at Oxford in 1877, and from the further but less significant fact that on the death of Tennyson he was approached by a member of the Cabinet, presumably with the sanction of Gladstone, and sounded as to whether he would accept the laureateship in the event of its being offered. Both offers were promptly declined, the one because Morris felt he lacked the academic spirit, the other because his tastes and his record were too remote from the requirements of a court appointment.

To his multifarious activities as poet and artist Morris added during the latter years of his life those of social reformer. He had always manifested a keen interest in political affairs, and while his temperament and independence of mind did not permit him to be a partisan in any narrow sense, or yield unswerving allegiance to any one party, he was for a time prominent in the affairs of the Liberal Party. He became treasurer of the National Liberal League in 1879; but two years later, owing to the Irish coercive measures, he left the party and drifted into socialism. In 1883 he formally identified himself with the recently organized Social Democratic Federation. Into this socialistic propaganda he threw himself with all the energy and fervor of his fiery nature. To it, while the spell was upon him, he gave, not only his leisure hours, but the thought and energy of his working hours as well. He abandoned pure literature, prose and verse. He produced nothing in the field of design. He neglected his business. No burden was too great for his strength in the cause of socialism. He served on the Executive Board of the Federation. He lectured night after night to all sorts of persons from audiences of Oxford undergraduates to outdoor labor meetings. He wrote stirring "chants for socialists." He was a regular contributor to *Justice*, the organ of the Federation. His financial contributions were hardly less important, for out of his own pocket for many months he paid the paper's weekly deficit. Its failure to pay expenses was largely owing to internal dissensions which threatened the existence of the Federation. Two factions, a radical one led by Hyndman and a moderate party of which Morris was the acknowledged leader, had arisen within the Federation and were contending for the control of the socialistic movement throughout England. The result was the withdrawal of Morris and his party in December, 1884, and the organization of a new body, the Socialist League, of which Morris became treasurer. A new paper was started called the *Commonweal*, of which he was made editor, and to which he again became the heaviest literary and financial con-

tributor. A series of articles in defense of socialism, written for the *Commonweal* during the years 1885 and 1886, were later revised in collaboration with Mr. E. Belfort Bax and published in book form under the title, *Socialism, its Growth and Outcome*.

After three years of unremitting labor as a socialist propagandist the high tension to which Morris had keyed himself began to relax. For some years longer, it is true, he continued an active and conscientious member of the Socialist League. But there was no longer the same complete abandon as of old. Literature and art began again to claim a share of his thought and energy. Partly as the cause and partly as the result of this renewed interest in literature and art, his attitude towards socialism became sensibly changed. He saw more and more clearly that the hope of any immediate realization of the principles of socialism must be abandoned; that the masses were not ready for it and would not know what to do with it if they had it; that they must first be organized and educated; and that the socialist movement, if it would accomplish anything of practical and permanent value, must rid itself of its visionary aims, address itself to an opportunist policy, and present to the country a program of immediate practicable reforms. This change of view is clearly reflected in Morris's socialistic writings. The best evidence of it is that he wrote *News from Nowhere* at all; for it is only when men have lost all hope of realizing their ideas that they take to dreaming about them. The busy toiler who sees the goal loom up in the distance has neither time nor inclination for dreams.

Morris was confirmed in these new views by certain happenings within the Socialist League. The rise of the labor, co-operative and similar movements, which, while they did not ignore social theories, were far more concerned about immediate results, had the effect of drawing off from the League many of its best members, particularly those who stood for a more moderate and more opportunist type of socialism. This left in the League a remnant of useless visionaries and pro-

fessed anarchists. In 1889 the latter element succeeded in securing control of the Executive Board and proceeded forthwith to revise the principles and policies of the League. One of the first things they did was to depose Morris from the control of the *Commonweal*. For a time he continued to contribute to it both money and matter, the latter including the successive chapters of *News from Nowhere*. With the conclusion of this serial which ran from January to October, 1890, he formally withdrew from the League. He saw nothing more that he could do. He knew no way of reconciling his views with those represented by the controlling element of the League. His withdrawal spelled the collapse of the League; and for himself it meant also an end of the hard weary work for militant socialism. He became a passive socialist and devoted his remaining years—there were only six—to literature and the making of socialists through the quiet influence of ideas.

News from Nowhere was revised in 1892 and published as a cheap volume in paper covers. It was widely read both in England and on the Continent, where it was quickly translated into French, German and Italian. It has been more widely read than any of the author's more important writings whether prose or verse. Morris was much influenced by More's *Utopia*, not so much by its particular features, perhaps, as by its general tone and spirit. He was undoubtedly far more influenced by it and Butler's *Erewhon*, which was one of the first and ablest of those utopias which mark the renaissance of the spirit of utopianism in the second half of the nineteenth century, than he was by such socialist treatises as Marx's *Capitalism*. It is not difficult to see why this should be so in the case of such a romantic spirit as that of Morris. Because of his indifference to abstract economic theories it was not uncommon for so-called scientific socialists, who professed to be versed in such matters, to accuse him of sentimentalism. The charge could not well be denied for in his socialism, as in his poetry and art, the demands of the romantic imagination proved irresistible.

But the immediate occasion which prompted the original publication of *News from Nowhere* in the columns of the *Commonweal* was the great favor with which Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, published a year or two previously, had been received both in Europe and America. It is altogether probable, too, that Morris was somewhat influenced by Bellamy's romance, for in certain external respects the two are quite similar. In both the narrator is translated in the course of a long sleep into a new social world, the one in Boston, the other in London. In both, again, the narrator describes the world in which he has been thus suddenly projected as it presents itself to his astonished gaze from day to day. In both, once more, the narrator is assisted in adjusting himself to his strange surroundings by a friendly mentor, an antiquarian, who has delved deep into social history, and who explains the less patent features of the new order of things and also the process through which it came to be.

In other and more essential respects, however, the two romances present a marked contrast. *Looking Backward* with its sequel, *Equality*, is a relatively complete picture of a world in which all things are new. The social structure is viewed from all angles. Everything is described and explained. The characters are real. *News from Nowhere*, on the other hand, is only a shadow picture. It lacks clearness and completeness. One is permitted to catch only an occasional glimpse of the new world, and when he catches that he is sure to be reminded that he is seeing through a glass darkly. The characters are unreal and the action is artificial. But this is nothing more than might have been expected. For Morris was a poet and artist before he was a social reformer; and the world which he depicts is an artist's utopia, an earthly Paradise, which is above all else beautiful. It abounds with beautiful landscapes, beautiful houses, beautiful furnishings and decorations, beautiful clothes, beautiful men and women and children. To such a world of beauty the social, political and industrial arrangements are only a convenient background.

The two romances differ again in the relative emphasis which they place on rural and urban life. *News from Nowhere* is a pastoral, a picture of rural life, whose quiet and refined rusticity is in marked contrast to the thinly veiled glorification of city life in *Looking Backward*. And along with this glorification of city life there is an apotheosis of machinery, not only in industry, but in social life generally, and particularly in government whose chief if not exclusive function is to direct industry. In *News from Nowhere*, on the other hand, there is little machinery in industry, nearly everything being made by hand; and none in government, for there is no government at all. The mainspring of all social life is found, not in a centralized supreme authority, as in *Looking Backward*, but in the mental and moral qualities of the individual. Perhaps Morris exaggerated this part of his picture to voice his protest against the tremendous centralization in government and industry inseparable from all schemes of state socialism, which in his day had proceeded far enough to render its real tendencies unmistakable. Because there is no longer any government *News from Nowhere* is very properly called an anarchistic utopia, although present-day socialists claim Morris for themselves and vigorously deny that he was an anarchist.

And then once more there is a difference between the two romances as to the nature of the change from the old social order to the new. In *Looking Backward* it is accomplished through a gradual and peaceful process, quite in accord with the principle of evolutionary socialism. In *News from Nowhere*, on the contrary, the new order is established only after a prolonged period of violence, disorder and bloodshed.

All this will serve to show that Morris did not fashion his scheme after that of Bellamy. In fact the two are in such striking contrast in fundamental matters as to warrant the belief that Morris went out of his way at times to accentuate his disapproval of Bellamy's scheme, which he did not hesitate to pronounce "deadly dull."

News from Nowhere is the narrative of an Englishman in

the fifties, a resident of London, who after an evening at his club, where he engaged in an acrimonious debate as to the society of the future and repeatedly lost his temper, returns to his lodgings in the suburbs, his mind still full of the evening's discussion. Falling into a broken sleep he goes through the most surprising adventures, which on awaking the next morning he determines to recount for the benefit of others. He awakens from his sleep of more than a century, he writes, with a sense of oppression, and looking out of his chamber window he is amazed to see a warm summer morning, whereas it was winter the evening before. He looks again to reassure himself that he is still in London. But he looks in vain for the old familiar landmarks. The grimy factories with their ugly smoke-vomiting chimneys are gone. The air is unbroken by the grating sounds of moving machinery. A beautifully decorated bridge of stone arches, "splendidly solid and as graceful as they are strong," has taken the place of the ugly iron one which formerly crossed the Thames near his lodgings. The river is lined on both sides with rows of pretty houses, "low and not large, standing back a little way from the river, mostly built of red brick and roofed with tiles, and looking comfortable and as though they were alive and sympathetic with the lives of the dwellers in them." In front of the houses reaching to the water's edge is a continuous garden filled with beautiful shrubbery and blooming sweet-scented flowers, and behind them patches of woodland stretch away as far as the eye can see. Mingled with the dwellings are buildings of more imposing appearance evidently devoted to public uses. One is a handsome structure of red brick with lead roof, surrounded with beautiful gardens, its walls decorated with friezes of figure subjects in baked clay, and its floors of marble mosaic. Another is of a "splendid and exuberant" style of architecture, embracing the best qualities of the Gothic of northern Europe with those of the Saracenic and Byzantine, though not a copy of any of these styles. The styles of dress have been transformed no less than the styles of architecture, both sexes

wearing a cross between the ancient classical costume and the simpler forms of the fourteenth-century garments, though clearly not a servile imitation of either. The men and women themselves are happy of face, joyous and frank in manner, shapely and well-knit of body, healthy looking, strong and comely.

The industrial system is unique even among utopias. The chief difficulty in ideal schemes of social reconstruction has been to find an adequate incentive to industry, particularly in the less agreeable kinds of work. This difficulty is of course materially enhanced in an anarchistic scheme of society where there is no government to direct industry. But Morris succeeds in solving the problem very much to his own satisfaction. The old doctrine that all work is suffering is unceremoniously rejected, and the contrary one laid down that work is in itself pleasurable. It is pleasurable for three reasons: first, because the hope of gain in honor and wealth is sufficient to cause pleasurable excitement even when the actual work is not pleasant; secondly, because it has grown into a pleasurable habit; and thirdly and mainly, for most work is of this kind, because there is a conscious sensuous pleasure in the work itself, as in the work of an artist. The great incentive to industry, then, lies in the joy of creation, the love of seeing things turn out beautiful under one's hands. This is basic in Morris's art, as well as in his economics and politics. It was here, too, that he quarreled most with Bellamy. "Mr. Bellamy worries himself unnecessarily," he wrote in the *Commonweal* soon after the appearance of *Looking Backward*, "in seeking, with obvious failure, some incentive to labor to replace the fear of starvation which is at present our only one; whereas it cannot be too often repeated that the true incentive to useful and happy labor is and must be pleasure in the work itself."

Since work is pleasurable, people would be unhappy if they did not engage in actually making things which turn out beautiful under their hands. Hence all will eagerly seek work, and the fear is, not that the necessary work will not be done,

but that some time there may be a shortage of work. Again, since work is pleasurable, there is no artificial coercion, no need of complex social machinery to put men to work and correlate the various parts of the industrial system. Every one is free to do what he can do best, limited only by the knowledge of what is wanted. Things are made because they are needed, not to enrich the maker. They are made, too, for the maker's neighbors, not for a vague distant market of which he knows nothing; and each one works, therefore, as if he were working for himself, making everything good and thoroughly fit for its purpose. No more is made than is needed, and the time and energy thus gained are made to enhance the pleasure of the work. To the same end everything is made by hand as far as possible, since machinery not only robs the maker of the joy of creation, but is wholly unable to produce works of art which are more and more demanded in this new world of beauty. The only exception to this principle is in the case of work which would be irksome if done by hand. If no machinery can be found to do such work, it is given up, and society does without the thing produced by it. The general disuse of machinery has had the effect of creating both a greater amount and a greater variety of work, so that there is perhaps little real danger of a shortage of work and no difficulty in finding work adapted to every turn of mind. It has also superseded that excessive centralization of industry which under the old order suppressed all individuality and transformed every worker into a machine. "It is necessary to point out," Morris wrote in the *Commonweal*, "that there are some socialists who do not think that the problem of the organization of life and necessary labor can be dealt with by a huge national centralization, working by a kind of magic, for which no one feels himself responsible; that on the contrary it will be necessary for the unit of administration to be small enough for every citizen to feel himself responsible for its details and be interested in them; that individual men cannot shuffle off the business of life on to the shoulders of an abstraction called the State, but

must deal with it in conscious association with each other; that variety of life is as much an aim of true communism as equality of condition, and that nothing but an union of these two will bring about real freedom; that modern nationalities are mere artificial devices for the commercial war, that we seek to put an end to, and will disappear with it; and finally, that art, using that word in its widest and due signification, is not a mere adjunct of life which free and happy men can do without, but the necessary expression and indispensable instrument of human happiness."

While Morris recognized the fundamental character of industry in any social scheme, he was not a materialist, and any thought of a merely materialistic earthly Paradise was thoroughly repugnant to him. He was too much of a poet and artist to be a materialist. "That ideal organization of life," one of his biographers wrote, "in which the names of rich and poor should disappear, together with the things themselves, in a common social well-being, was in itself to him a mere body, of which art, as the single high source of pleasure, was the informing soul."

The foregoing description of the process of production will indicate how meagerly that part of the industrial system is treated. The whole thing is vague and incomplete. It abounds with glittering generalities. Concrete details are conspicuously lacking. But the process of distribution is even more indefinite, and must be left almost entirely to inference. All wealth appears to be in common, the ownership being vested in the commune. The question whether the common fund is divided among the members equally or in accordance with their respective needs is left untouched. Hardly any one but a poet or artist could have passed by so vital a matter. While both principles of distribution are undoubtedly communistic, certain incidents in the story point to the latter as the accepted one. If this be the case, then the communistic formula, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," must be revised so as to read, "from each according to the

pleasure which he finds in labor, to each according to his needs as these are measured, not by any external authority, but by himself." This is unadulterated anarchism.

One of the first effects of the destruction of capitalism was the melting together of the city and country. Rushing from the crowded cities the people greedily seized on the lands, so long the exclusive possession of a small class, and established by voluntary coöperation various forms of industry. To this mixing of town and country, which greatly lessened the differences between the two and vivified the country by the thought and briskness of town-bred folk, is attributed that happy and leisurely but eager life so characteristic of the new society. In fact, the distinction between town and country has all but disappeared; and England, instead of a country "of huge and foul workshops and fouler gambling dens, surrounded by ill-kept poverty-stricken farms pillaged by the masters of the workshops," has become one vast garden, in which nothing is wasted, nothing spoiled, and over which lie scattered the necessary dwellings, sheds and workshops, all trim and neat and pretty. The population of the country is no greater than before; it is only more evenly distributed. Everybody lives where and as he likes. Some prefer living in small households, while others elect to live together in considerable numbers in great buildings, such as the former country seats of the nobility, where society is brightened and quickened by the variety of mind and mood inseparable from large groups of persons pursuing different interests and engaged in different occupations. While the separate households differ more or less in their habits, any good-tempered person who is willing to live as the members of a particular household live is seldom refused admittance.

The transformed industrial system has profoundly modified the theory and practice of education. Since the sole reward of life is the joy of creation, children are educated almost exclusively along industrial and artistic lines. They live out of doors whenever possible. In the summer time large parties

of them play together for weeks in the woods living in tents. Here they learn to love nature and do things for themselves. By imitating their elders they acquire the ability to do almost anything with their hands. In the same way they pick up a knowledge of foreign living languages. Latin and Greek are taught but they are in no great demand, being too remote from the accepted philosophy of life. For similar reasons book learning is not encouraged. There is little formal schooling, which, we are amazed to learn, is a necessary concomitant to poverty. Formerly society was so miserably poor, runs the argument, owing to the system of licensed robbery upon which it was founded, that there was no leisure for education. At a certain age, regardless of their tasks or aptitudes, children were thrust into schools, where they were put through a conventional course of learning, again without regard to their varying tastes and aptitudes. Education was a hot-house process, and no one had time to grow owing to the pressure of economic conditions. But now, because of the great increase in the nation's wealth, as well as its equitable distribution, both due to communism, each one can afford to take time to grow and consult his inclinations in the acquisition of knowledge, which is not something to be accomplished in a few months or years but a life-long process.

The sex relations approach perilously near to free love. Private property having been abolished, commercial marriages are obviously unknown. All marriages are presumed to be grounded on love and respect, but if a couple happen to tire of each other they are at liberty to separate and contract new connections. It would be manifestly improper, it is argued, to enforce a contract of sentiment, whether by public opinion or by a court of law, and require a pretense of unity and affection after the reality of it is gone. Woman has ceased to be the slave and plaything of man. But lest such emancipation might be thought to spell the decline of the function of maternity we are assured that maternity is highly honored. While the natural pains incident to motherhood cannot be abrogated,

its artificial disabilities can be and have been annulled because due to poverty. For under the new order of things a mother can no longer have any mere sordid anxieties for the future, knowing that whether her children turn out well or badly in other respects no artificial disabilities can make them something less than men and women. Such a woman, it is argued, has more rather than less instinct for maternity.

All government has been abolished because unnecessary; and it is unnecessary because the abolition of private property and the establishment of economic equality have superseded the need of protecting the rich against the poor, which was formerly the sole function of government. There is neither civil nor criminal law, for the one is wholly and the other very largely required by the principle of private property. There are no laws even to govern the exchange of goods. While there are certain regulations, without which exchange could not go on, they are determined by general custom; nobody thinks of opposing them and so there is no provision for their enforcement. Crime is almost entirely the consequence of the system of private property, the abolition of which leaves no rich class with its special privileges to heed enemies against society. Crimes of violence are no exception to this. Thus certain crimes of this class spring from family tyranny, which is itself rooted in private property; with the abolition of private property the family is held together, not by any form of legal or social coercion, but by mutual affection. Other crimes of violence proceed from the artificial perversion of the sexual passions; with the abolition, along with private property, of the legal principle that the woman is the property of the man these crimes have likewise disappeared. Then there are certain crimes again which are made possible by low standards of honor and public estimation; with the higher standards which have followed the abolition of private property these crimes have like the others disappeared.

In the sense, then, of an habitual transgression of the rights of others crime has no existence, since practically all the in-

centives to such transgressions are lacking. This does not mean that nobody ever transgresses the habit of good fellowship. But when such transgressions do occur they are regarded as the errors of friends, not the habitual acts of persons at war with society. In all cases of violence the transgressor is expected to make any atonement possible to him. But there is no coercion on the part of society to require him to make reparation, and no penalty meted out to him if he refuses. To torture or destroy one, who, in a moment of uncontrolled wrath or anger, has offended, would be in no sense an atonement to society. It would be only an additional injury to it, for the penalty would turn the remorse, which is sure to follow the transgression and which is relied upon as sufficient to prevent a repetition of the offense, to wrath and anger, and rouse within the offender the spirit of revenge.

While every one is at liberty to do as he pleases in purely personal matters, society is not without some kind of control in matters of common interest, some device for giving expression to the collective thought and purpose. Each commune manages its own affairs and it does so in this fashion. Some one thinks that something ought to be done or undone by the commune and presents his proposition at the next communal mote. If all agree to it the thing is done. If no one else supports the proposition it is dropped. If there is division of opinion the matter is postponed to the next mote, when it is discussed and voted on. If the majority is small the question is again put off for further discussion. This is done perhaps repeatedly, and if the majority continues small the proposition is finally dropped. If the majority is large the minority is asked to yield to the majority opinion, which it commonly does. But if it declines to yield another discussion is had, and another vote taken, and if it then appears that the minority has made no appreciable gain since the last vote it is almost sure to yield.

Despite the fact that *News from Nowhere* was widely read, it has led to no such agitation for the reconstruction of society as followed the publication of *Looking Backward*. The reason

for this is that it was too much out of joint with modern social tendencies. It looked one way while the world was rapidly moving in the opposite direction. It demanded the abolition of all government at a time when greater burdens were constantly being imposed upon government. It proposed a system of industry based on hand labor and individual initiative at a time when men were placing more and more faith in machinery and centralization. This could hardly fail to chill the ardor of the agitator. But besides its remoteness from the world of to-day *News from Nowhere* is open to the further and more general criticism that its interest is in things rather than in men; and if the author does happen to concern himself with the fortunes of men it is with collectivities rather than with individuals. The crowd fired his enthusiasm; to the individuals composing it he was indifferent. The sufferings of a class excited his deepest sympathies; the miseries of individuals scarcely appealed to him at all. He did not understand the individual and did not know how to deal with him. These qualities appear also in his poetry, which, though it frequently deals with human passions, always exhibits them as in a picture. He is more concerned with the attitude and arrangement of a group than with the realization of a character. The same may be said of his art. It is this impersonal quality of mind which has stamped Morris's social dreams with a certain artificiality, vagueness, abstractness and farawayness, a certain lack of reality and concrete detail. They are dreams and must ever remain so.

LANCASTER, PA.

XII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE EVOLUTION OF A THEOLOGIAN. By Stephen Szymanowski. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Cloth. 350 pages. Price \$2.00 net.

The theologian whose "evolution" is portrayed in this notable piece of fiction with a purpose, is an Episcopalian clergyman of the advanced school. Early in his ministry his attention was called by a learned friend to the untenableness of the ethical and religious conceptions underlying his preaching, in the light of modern biblical and scientific knowledge. Loyalty to the doctrinal standards of his church, he at first imagines, requires him to maintain the soundness of traditional views. At the same time, however, he resolves by personal inquiry to justify his theological position. His studies lead him step by step into the depths of science, biblical criticism and philosophy, and the result of his open-minded search after the truth compels him reluctantly to surrender a large number of age-old views and to adopt in their stead those whose validity seemed established by present-day methods of investigation.

For awhile he attempts to suppress his personal convictions and to preach what the "Church" expected him to preach rather than what he conceived to be the truth. Ere long conscience forces him to recognize the inconsistency he is practicing and to adopt another course. He withdraws from the ecclesiastical establishment under whose authority he is chafing and finds peace of mind and heart in the freedom of privacy and independence to which he retires. He surrounds himself with a group of sympathetic men and women to whom he discourses from time to time, and wins them to rejoice in the warmth and light of the liberty wherewith Christ has made men free.

The discussions with his learned clerical friend, to which his retirement to private life is ascribed, are remarkable for the wide area of thought which they cover, and for the keenness of argument which throughout characterizes them. The fields of biblical criticism, of scientific research, of philosophical speculation and of comparative religion are carefully surveyed. The theory of evolution brings added light for the solution of the perplexing problems that are suggested and for the verification of the newer conceptions of the truth that are found. It brings him intellectual emancipation, offers his life the poise which secures judgment upon its acts and aspirations, instead of the blind and quick satiation of the emotions

he had previously relied on, and thus furnishes him, not a knowledge of metaphysics or of theology, but a knowledge of the simple art of true living.

The book is not at all easy reading, but it abounds in thought that is at once informing and suggestive, even though often it is not conclusive.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

GETTING TOGETHER—ESSAYS ON THE REGULATIVE IDEAS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. Edited by James M. Whiton. New York, Sturgis and Walton Company. Cloth. 303 pages. Price \$1.50 net.

The essays comprising the contents of this notable volume furnish a concrete illustration of the "getting together" of representative men from different religious communions under the influence of the doctrine of the divine immanence and that of theistic evolution. Members respectively of the Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Episcopalian, the Jewish, the Methodist, the Presbyterian, the Unitarian, and the Universalist communions, the authors are here "associated in an exposition of the fundamentals of a theology accepted by them all." Variety of style, of grasp and of insight, of course, characterizes the respective productions of the individual writers, but the substantial agreement of them all in religious concept and practical emphasis is remarkable and lends added interest and significance to their discussions.

Following the editor's initial chapter on "The Ultimate Reality," a number of the most important fundamental themes of religious and theological thought are treated in succession by the collaborating writers, all of whom believe in an immanent God progressively at work in cosmic and human history, and gradually accomplishing His purposes in accordance with what is known as the evolutionary method. The application of the principles of purely theistic thought to the re-study of the fundamental doctrines referred to, is attempted by these scholars and the result furnishes at least a tentative answer to those who have been asking with some concern and anxiety what the outcome of such application to our inherited formulas of doctrine would be.

Readers of these expository studies on "The Natural and the Supernatural," "The Law and the Will of God," "The Incarnation," "Revelation," "Redemption," "Judgment," "Atonement," and "Salvation," will be likely to discover two things, first that the so-called New Theology can deal with these doctrines without the sacrifice of religious fervor, and second that in their modern form these doctrines continue to retain the power of quickening and sustaining the spirit of hopefulness and of enforcing the higher moral and spiritual values of life. Those who feel the perplexity that is often involved in giving up the old in favor of the new, should find grateful help in the illuminating and stimulating

essays here brought together. Among the theological books of the season, perhaps none will so clearly indicate the nature of the scientific attitude toward the religious realities as conceived of by constantly increasing numbers of men in our times, or offer a more satisfactory vindication of that attitude, than that found in these pages.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIANITY. By Professor Josiah Royce. New York, Macmillan Co. 2 vols. Cloth. 425-442 pages. Price \$3.50 net.

In the realm of philosophy the name of the distinguished author of these stately volumes carries great weight. He has a lengthy list of publications to his credit, and has won for himself deserved fame as a thinker both at home and abroad. His pronouncements on many profound metaphysical questions are widely acknowledged to be authoritative, and quoted constantly by others with approbation. What such a gifted person has to say on the problem of Christianity—a problem which the present-day situation is resistlessly pressing upon the notice of all thoughtful men—we may be sure is commandingly important and abundantly worthy of our attention even though it may fail to convince us of the soundness of its contentions and conclusions.

To convey anything like even an approximately accurate idea of the philosophic insight into the current religious problem, the breadth of the historic scope with which it is examined, and the wealth of learning that enriches the discussion of it in these pages, would require far more space than is editorially assigned to these notes. A very superficial sketch of the closely argued contents of these books and of the general trend of their thought, must suffice to call our readers' attention to them.

Two circumstances in the present religious situation are responsible in Professor Royce's opinion for raising the problem that the world over is clamoring for solution: First, the thought-forms in which the doctrines of traditional theology are clothed have been outgrown. They fail, therefore, to meet with the acceptance and approval of those who are the real leaders of thought and action. Second, the insistence upon traditional views in strictly "orthodox" church-circles, by which large numbers of men, in the interests of loyalty to the truth and of personal intellectual freedom, feel compelled to renounce ecclesiastical allegiance and to advocate an individualistic, churchless type of Christianity as better adapted to meet the religious requirements of the future. Whilst acknowledging the perplexity of such a situation, Professor Royce holds both the reactionary and the progressive parties here at variance if not in conflict, to be in error. The solution he proposes is different at once from that upon which the orthodox traditionalists insist and from that which the progressive rationalist

advances. In the pursuit of his argument to establish and justify his proposed solution, the question as to what Christianity really is, must be answered since upon that answer the solution must finally rest. The contents of the first volume are devoted to the consideration of this fundamental inquiry.

In accompanying the author through the course of this investigation, one meets with several surprises which may be briefly indicated. (1) He declines to adopt the now widely if not generally accepted view, that to know the essence of Christianity we must go back to Jesus and the authentic records of his teaching as preserved in the first three of the Gospels. He accepts the doctrines of Paul as the source from which the true nature and content of Christianity must be ascertained. (2) Because the historical evidences for a reliable opinion as to any details about the person and life of the Founder of Christianity, are lacking, he declines (and insists "I have a right to decline") to express an opinion about him. (3) He contends Jesus never intended his words to be a final and all-sufficient expression of the true religion, and adds that the religion which men have loved and been saved by has been an interpretation of the significance of the person of Christ working with power in the Church. (4) He instances three ideas as constituting, in his mind, the fundamentals of Christianity—first, a universal community; second, an individual moral burden, a need of salvation which must come to him from without; and third, the doctrine of atonement. Into the details of his exposition of these three essentials we cannot here follow him.

The contents of the second volume are devoted to an inquiry as to whether these fundamental ideas of Christianity are in harmony with the fundamentals of the universe, as disclosed by modern historical, scientific and philosophical investigation. Here the author's metaphysical views regarding the nature of the universe we are living in, are developed, and the basal facts of Christianity shown to be in accord with those views of the universe. Some of these pages must be described as Peter did some of Paul's doctrines—"hard to be understood." The social aspects of Christianity receive strong emphasis, loyalty to "the community ideal" is warmly advocated, and "the spirit of the community" is made to stand for some vague form of super-human reality whose identity with "the ultimate cosmic principle" is confidently affirmed—an identity that is required to justify his "religion of loyalty" and to inform it with the meaning of the "cosmic religion." The mental vigor with which these profound discussions throb, the searching criticism of various older and newer types of religious and theological notions which come to be incidentally noticed, and the courageous, not to say venturesome, spirit with which the author's individual opinions are stated and defended, combine to give a rare charm to his successive lectures. The books

are somewhat expensive, but those interested in the deeper philosophic aspects of Christianity will be richly repaid for the outlay which their purchase requires.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

MELCHIZEDEK. By G. W. Reaser. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French and Company. Cloth. 185 pages. Price \$1.25 net.

The sub-title to this volume—The Exaltation of the Son of Man—reveals the admirable purpose its author aims to accomplish.

It is a painstaking study of those passages of Scripture in which our Lord is represented as a "Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." The writer has manifestly devoted much time to the investigation of the mysterious personality to whom Abraham offered tithes, and his views as to his character are interesting. It is plain that Mr. Reaser is fascinated by his theme and by the peculiar interpretation he gives to it. It must be acknowledged that he has made the most of his subject that is possible. Unfortunately, perhaps some would prefer to say fortunately, he runs counter in his methods to the prevailing ones of our times, in dealing with questions of inspiration and exegesis. He believes that "in Adam's fall we sinned all" and accepts "the plan of salvation" which in accordance with that belief is required to provide for man's escape from the dire consequences of the fall. For a large majority of the readers of the *Reformed Church Review*, no such book, well intentioned and finely written though it be, can have a commanding message.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN. By D. A. Hayes. Methodist Book Concern, Eaton & Mains Publishing Agents, 150 Fifth Ave., New York. Cloth. Pages viii + 183. Price \$.75 net.

This book is not a treatise on the Bible, as one might conclude from its suggestive title. It is devoted to the Gospel of St. Luke which Renan first called "the most beautiful book ever written." While narrow in its scope, the work covers a wide range of thought. It portrays the versatile personality of Luke in graphic sketches. Large deductions are based upon scant historic data, but they are made to appear sane and plausible. At all events they invest the Beloved Physician with flesh and blood and make him more than a shadow in a remote age. His message is treated similarly. No attempt is made to raise and discuss critical questions or doctrinal issues. The treatment is popular and devotional. It bristles with fine points and it glows with a manly piety. The content of the book quite vindicates its title. Certainly every reader of it will find that St. Luke, the man and the book, is far more beautiful than the superficial student knows. One takes pleasure in recommending a volume so wholesome and helpful.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

CONSTRUCTIVE NATURAL THEOLOGY. By Newman Smyth. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. Pages viii + 123. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Smyth does not profess to be a scientist; but he is well read in science, and his wide knowledge in different fields serves him a good purpose in the discussion of questions which bear on the relation between science and theology. In a former work, "Through Science to Faith," he showed how many questions are raised by science which science is unable to answer, while at the same time the tendency of scientific discovery is to find indications all along the line of a power over and above the forces which are at work, chemical and physical forces, in carrying forward the progressive development of the world, so that, in a sense, evolution becomes revelation, and science prepares the way for faith. In the work now under review the author goes a step farther, and he endeavors to point out how certain facts and processes in the material and spiritual development of the world furnish a foundation on which, in the light of modern science, a system of Natural Theology may be constructed.

In one sense the title is misleading and, for that reason, the book may be somewhat disappointing. "Constructive Natural Theology," one might suppose, would mean an effort to construct a system of natural theology. But the author does not mean to present such a system here and now. He promises to take that up later. He tries to show rather, that although the progress of natural science has made the older forms of natural theology, as in the Bridgewater Treatises, for instance, absolutely of no value, the science of the present day furnishes abundant material which the theologian should use in the formation and construction of a natural theology valid and cogent in the light of the latest scientific discoveries. He cites a number of scientific facts of this kind, and he points out the direction which the theologian must take to find their full bearing and significance in the solution of his problem.

Starting with ether and the electric ion, the author follows the development of the physical world through its various stages, and finds first of all that "there is not one chance in countless millions of millions that the unique properties of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, and especially of their stable compounds, water and carbonic acid, which chiefly make up the atmosphere of a new planet, should simultaneously occur in three elements otherwise than through the operation of a natural law which somehow connects them together." Hence he infers that there must be a directing power which tends towards a definite future; and all along the line there appear features in the progressive movement which would have been impossible if the necessary conditions upon which they depend had not been provided for in advance. This is true all through the plant and animal worlds in the various changes

and transformations which characterize their progressive evolution.

Turning to the spiritual world as over against the material, stress is laid on the significant fact that the historical movement leads up to and culminates in the unique personality of Jesus Christ, and that the supreme values of life are not material but spiritual, and that the meaning of the whole process of evolution is found in the dominating power of Personality.

The book is interesting, sometimes eloquent, and cannot fail to be helpful to the general reader, and especially to the minister of the gospel.

JOHN S. STAHR.

MY OWN STORY, ILLUSTRATING THE SPIRIT AND SERVICE OF BIG BUSINESS.
By Joseph H. Appel. New York, The Platt & Peck Co. Price 50 cents net.

When a man knows a great deal about a subject and writes about it briefly and charmingly, his book is likely to be worth reading. This is such a book. The author is to-day director of publicity for one of the great department stores of America. He knows a great deal about the spirit of successful business. He knows, furthermore, how to write straightforward English. He lacks neither ideas nor imagination. The fact is that the small book which lies before us is absorbingly interesting. There are few who when once they begin reading it, will fail to finish it at the first sitting. The book is a peculiar combination of autobiography and philosophy, or rather it is a philosophy of life wrought out of life's experience and applied to modern business conditions. The thought underlying the book is, that the secret of true life is to be found in the right relation of the individual to the universal. It is really the activistic philosophy of Eucken, though the writer does not so designate it. Eucken would say there is a life superior to the individual himself. The individual is partly the creator of the life-process and partly the carrier of it. There is a cosmic life-process greater than the individual. The quest of the individual for that which is universal involves a *struggle* of his whole nature. Freedom is obtained through this struggle and subsequent adjustment and self-surrender. Personality develops more and more by coming into direct contact and sympathy with the universal life. Thus are self-activity and dependence supplementary. This fundamental life-philosophy of Rudolf Eucken, as modified by the Englishman Troward, the author of this little book applies to his own life and to the life of the business world in general.

Mr. Appel shows in the first chapters of the book how in early life through very real experiences there came to him a sense of a higher power, of a universal life. He shows how he fruitlessly struggled against it, in his home, in college, in the great world

of affairs, how he tried to develop his individuality by ignoring the over-individual elements in life, and how by this process he came on a number of occasions to the point of failure. He then tells how through life's experience he came to see that real freedom and the development of real personal strength lay in becoming one with the larger life around him.

The unique part of the book lies in the application of this philosophy of life to the business world. The author shows that a big business is a world in itself; it is like a cosmic process. It has a spirit of its own. It is a living thing. Individuals have helped to create this spirit. Individuals are to be carriers of it. Success for the business in general and for the individual in particular comes, only as the living spirit of a business or of an institution gets into a man, and as a man gets to be one with the spirit of the business or institution he is to serve. The whole book is stimulating and vigorous. It develops a great idea in simple concrete form. It will prove helpful to many young men who are trying to find themselves in the business world.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

A ONE-SIDED AUTOBIOGRAPHY. By Oscar Kuhns, Professor in Wesleyan University. New York, Eaton and Mains. Price \$1.00 net.

This book contains the story of the intellectual life of a man of broad culture and large experience in things academic. It is the intimate revelation of the mind and heart of one who for many years has been a true lover of books. The author shows a wide knowledge of most of the greater and many of the minor authors of the world's literature. He describes the early book life of his boyhood days in Lancaster County, the development of intellectual ideals through college and university studies, his subsequent reading for entertainment and pleasure, the growth of his love of poetry, and the many durable satisfactions that have come to his life from a constant study of the great and inexhaustible world classics. The book is written frankly and with a noble enthusiasm for all that is best in the companionship of books. In a clear, charming style the author tells what books have influenced his life, his thought, his manner of writing. He has a distinct individuality, opinions of his own in things literary, opinions worth while. The best part of the book probably is that in which the author analyzes the permanent qualities to be found in the great poets. His interpretation of Dante and of the perennial interest of the *Divine Comedy*, his enthusiasm for Homer, Schiller and Browning, his admiration for Molière, whom he characterizes as the essence of common sense, his love of Dickens, "the man who believed in the essential goodness of men"—these are only a few hints of the many splendid things to be found in the volume before us. On every page we meet with an account of the real value of some

book which we have read or which after our introduction to it by this author, we feel that we would like to read. This autobiography—the confession of a book-lover—will prove to be a valuable stimulus to young men in helping to shape their habits of reading. It will be valued also by those who find in these pages their own experiences with the masterpieces of literature sympathetically interpreted. We are grateful to the author for this charming narrative of his own mental development.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

WHEEL-CHAIR PHILOSOPHY. By John Leonard Cole. New York, Eaton and Mains. Price 75 cents net.

The book is a recital of a personal experience, and a record of the thoughts inspired by that experience. The author was the victim of a terrible accident. He lay for months in a hospital with a broken back; as by a miracle he gradually recovered. He is to-day an acceptable minister of the Gospel. The story of his tragic experience, the picture of his life in a city hospital and of his acquaintances in a sanitarium, the reflections on the meaning and significance of life as it appears to one who has gone through the fire of affliction with brave heart and cheerful faith—all these factors serve to make this simple, artless record of human life a book of genuine interest. It will surely serve the author's purpose of bringing hope and cheer to some who may be pupils in the school of affliction.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

LETTERS TO EDWARD. By Malcolm J. McLeod. New York, Fleming H. Revell Co. Price \$1.00 net.

There is something intensely human and interesting about this volume of letters. They are not imaginary epistles but the real revelation of the heart and mind of a busy modern metropolitan minister to a friend and fellowminister who is stricken with a fatal disease. Of course the letters were never intended to appear in book form. The author says they are published for one reason solely, viz., that it was Edward's last request. Personally we are grateful that the letters have been published. They are so absolutely spontaneous, genuinely real that they grip the heart of the reader as a more conscious literary effort would not do. They picture in vivid, unconcealed form the joys and disheartenments of a modern pastor in a city like New York. With a delightful touch of realism and with a directness and a charm which is truly refreshing the author portrays the unique conditions and problems of the religious world of our day. His observations on modern life are singularly keen and sane. A genial humor runs through every page of the author's personal experience. The book is as good as a tonic, brimful of good cheer and splendid opti-

mism ; running through it all there is a delicate sympathy, a manly vigor and a sense of appreciation of the things really worth while. It is a real human document, more valuable by far than scores of books which are written with painful consciousness of the market, but which lack the elements of attraction and appeal characteristic of this volume. The book is distinctly uplifting and helpful.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 2.—APRIL—1914.

I.

CREATIVE EVOLUTION.¹

R. C. SCHIEDT.

Evolution, the modern theory which attempts to explain the origin and structure of the universe, still occupies the foreground of all intellectual interests. The discussions are indeed no longer so personal and acrimonious as they were fifty years ago, there is even an almost universal agreement that the fundamental principles of Newton, Kant, Lamarck, Lyell and Darwin are correct, that the theories which trace the beginning of the material universe back to a spiral nebula and the start of life to a bit of protoplasm whence all living beings descended are incontrovertible. But there is an ever growing difference of opinion regarding the methods of the descent from such beginnings. As a result a number of schools have arisen who draw their disciples from all departments of knowledge and from every sphere of life, because evolutionary thinking has influenced all forms of thought. These schools may be classified into two groups, the vitalistic and the mechanistic group. The former may again be divided into the old and the new

¹ *Creative Evolution* by Henri Bergson. Authorized translation by Arthur Mitchell, Ph.D. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1911. The language of the book is maintained throughout this article.

vitalistic and the latter into the Lamarckian and the Darwinian schools. The representatives of the Vitalistic school hold that any phenomenon which cannot be explained by the laws of chemistry and physics is due to the influence of a mysterious immaterial agency which endowed with reasoning and designing powers guides and watches the development and functional activity of each individual being, the representatives of the mechanistic school maintain that all phenomena whether animate or inanimate are alike the results of physical and chemical agencies and changes. Both schools are represented by many earnest and honest thinkers.

The Mechanistic school was at first in the ascendancy. It centered in matter as the object of its investigation and matter threatened to devour all values including the soul, life, all spiritual development in history, as well as all spiritual values in the moral realm and in the sphere of art. We had for a time, and to a degree still have, well established schools in history, art and literature solely based on naturalistic standards. In metaphysics the doctrines of Positivism prevailed demanding that the mature mind occupy itself only with quantitative values, with phenomena which coexist and develop in space and time, which enable men to determine future phenomena on the basis of laws derived from such observed phenomena. The transcendental was a realm closed to such observation and the truly modest seeker could only be an agnostic. Positivism and agnosticism became the watchwords of the day. But in the course of time a reaction set in, a hunger made itself felt for a new form of metaphysics leading the minds out of the mechanistic and materialistic tendencies. Edward v. Hartmann demanded that speculation be also subjected to the laws of the inductive method and the cry "back to Kant" became the fashion of the day. In the realm of the plastic art naturalism and verism were displaced by the symbolisms of Bourne Jones and Ludwig von Hofmann and the analytical novel of the Zola type was followed by the psychological novel of Gabriele d'Annunzio and the romanticism of Maeterlinck and Hauptmann.

In the sphere of pure Science purely mechanistic studies of physics and chemistry were supplemented by the investigations of the new biology, in which the new vitalism of Driesch, Reinke, Wiegand and others and the reintroduction of teleology prevailed over against the extreme mechanistic views of such Darwinists as Roux, Loeb and Whitman. The problems of life became the burning question. Within the sphere of the Social sciences there developed the theory that the growth of purely cultural institutions with its spiritual values could not be interpreted according to the mechanistic scheme and over against the problem of nature and natural law we get the problem of personality and of cultural values.

These changes again directed the attention of thinkers to the problem which in the inquiry of mind as over against matter is of such tremendous importance, viz., the problem of freedom. This was particularly the case in French philosophy. The Kantians, Renouvier and Lachelier, emphasized Kant's idea of freedom as over against the law of cause and effect as of central importance. They went, however, beyond Kant by transferring this freedom to the unknowable world of transcendentalism into the world of experience. Their chief follower in the United States is William James, in Germany Rudolf Eucken, in France Henri Bergson. They do not aim at merely disposing of naturalism nor do they despise the fundamental principles of modern evolution. They fight energetically against the humiliation of philosophy as a mere servant of specialism, they make bold to philosophize on the facts themselves, to look at these facts with different eyes from the representatives of the exact sciences. They openly cultivate metaphysics, but a metaphysics quite different from the old scholastic type, it is distinctively evolutionary. We shall confine ourselves especially to Bergson and his *Creative Evolution*.

Bergson is both scientist and philosopher. His life is at every turn the scintillating effulgence of a brilliant mind. He was born in Paris on October 18, 1859 and educated at the College Fontane, now Condorcet, one of the largest and best

collegiate institutions in France. He excelled in all studies linguistic, philosophical and scientific and received many prizes among them the great prize for mathematics. Being for sometime uncertain whether to devote himself to letters or to the exact sciences he studied both with equal zeal, but finally decided to enter the literary department of the "Ecole Normale supérieur" which was then the real training school for future university professors. After three years of most distinguished devotion to philosophical studies he passed the difficult competitive examination of the Agrégation in 1883 and was immediately appointed a college professor serving at first as professor of philosophy at Clermont-Ferrand in the Auvergne and later at the Collège Rollin and then at the Lycée Henri IV in Paris. In the meantime he had published and publicly defended his doctor dissertation on an "Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience" and after a most brilliant disputation had been made a "docteur ès-lettres avec mention philosophie." In 1878 he became "maitre de conférences" at the Ecole Normale Supérieure where for two years he exercised a most wholesome influence on the future university professors. In 1900 he became full professor at the Collège de France, the foremost university of France, and in 1901 a permanent member of the "Institut de France."

Bergson is reputed to be above all a born educator, his fascinating personality and brilliant lectures, new in content, positive in character and painstaking in thoroughness, are attracting an enthusiastic throng of the best young minds of France, who crowd his lecture halls. But his influence reaches far beyond his home land. The Columbia University Press has just published a contribution to a bibliography of the French philosopher. It includes 90 books and articles by himself and 417 books and articles written about him. These 417 items represent 11 different languages divided as follows: French 170; English 159; German 40; Italian 19; Polish 5; Dutch 3; Spanish 3; Roumanian 2; Swedish 2; Russian 2;

Hungarian 1. This bibliography is a part of the intellectual and personal welcome which Columbia University extended to Henri Bergson in 1912, when he was appointed exchange professor to that university by the French government. "The liberal Protestants in France gladly accept Bergson's ideas, the Catholics read and study his writings, the Pragmatists find new arguments in them, the Socialists would like to claim him as their own, the scholars rejoice in the new material for study he constantly presents and the mystics see in his books new proofs for the supernatural." William James says, "Open Bergson's books and new horizons will open up before your eyes on every page." Some of his enthusiastic French admirers claim that this philosophy is of as much importance in the history of European Metaphysics as Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, nay that he is "le seul philosophe de premier ordre qu'aient en la France depuis Descartes et l'Europe depuis Kant." While we cannot endorse this exorbitant praise we must acknowledge that for the last sixty years not a single philosopher has exerted so great an influence in France as Henri Bergson and we may add that no philosopher of modern times has entered upon the discussion of the evolutionary problem with so much sympathy and yet so much original grasp as to make it fundamentally different from both the prevailing materialistic and positivistic conception, and from teleological interpretations.

Bergson is preëminently a biological philosopher. For this reason his chief work on *Creative Evolution*, which appeared in 1907 and has since gone through six editions, embraces the whole universe in its discussion, for the will to live, the vital impetus, plays the chief rôle in the universe. The basic principles of this work are contained partly in his doctor's thesis, in which he deals with the immediate facts of consciousness, and partly in a later essay on *Matter and Memory*. In the former he attacks the claims of the prevailing mechanistic methods by a keen analysis of the values of numbers, of time and space, which culminates in the statement, that the world

the mathematician deals with is a world that dies and is reborn every instant—the world which Descartes was thinking of when he spoke of continued creation. But, in time thus conceived, how could evolution, which is the very essence of life, ever take place? Evolution implies a real persistence of the past in the present, a duration which is, as it were, a hyphen, a connecting link. Therefore a mathematico-mechanistic science cannot interpret the true nature of things spiritual or psychic. In the essay on *Matter and Memory* he tries to refute the theories of the school of psycho-physical parallelism both from the standpoint of the theory of knowledge and from that of psychology, especially pathological psychology. According to Bergson consciousness does not need the brain for the formation of images, but only as a tool for action in the material world. The brain is therefore ultimately an apparatus of motility. In order to act upon matter it must be analyzed and this function is performed by intelligence. For this purpose intelligence subjects nature to the idea of space, which is indefinitely divisible and shows an unlimited number of successive but separate elements. Such thinking is geometric thinking, which never leads into the inner essence of reality, neither in material nature nor in the world of speculation. The truly real endurance (*durée*) which includes everything in mutual interpenetration can only be comprehended by intelligence in time-concepts which after the manner of space are disconnected. Consequently intelligence is not only capable of comprehending the inner essence of the external world but it also transforms the innate tendencies of self consciousness into mere aids for practical action never for metaphysical interpretation. The intellect only furnishes symbols which are a sufficient basis for all practical conduct. Exact science is a work of pure intellect and the intellect is at home in the presence of unorganized matter. This matter it makes use of more and more by mechanical inventions and mechanical inventions become the easier to it the more it thinks matter as mechanism. Now when the intellect undertakes the study of life it necessarily

treats the living like the inert, applying the same forms to this new object, carrying over into this new field the same habits that have succeeded so well in the old; and it is right to do so for only on such terms does the living offer to our action the same hold as inert matter. But the truth we thus arrive at is only a symbolic verity, for it is only dealing with the living object in the external aspect. The duty of philosophy should be to intervene here actively, to examine the living without any reservation as to practical utility, but freeing itself from forms and habits that are strictly intellectual. Its own special object is to speculate, that is to see. Intuition is the only organ that penetrates to the absolute reality of things.

From this point of view Bergson submits the various present forms of evolution to a common test and shows the unsurmountable difficulties against which they strike, without, however, rejecting them altogether. He admits that they are supported by a considerable number of facts and that each of them must correspond to a certain aspect of the process of evolution. But he claims that it is the business of philosophy, which does not contemplate any practical application and is not constrained by scientific precision, to present the reality of which these theories present only a partial view in its transcending totality. When Darwin and his school claim that the species of plants and animals have arisen by slow variation due to accidental chemico-physical differences inherent in the germ and not to the experiences or behavior of the adult individual Bergson protests that these differences are not purely accidental but due to an impulsion which passes from germ to germ across the individuals, possibly appearing at the same time in all or at least in a certain number of the representatives of the same species. This impulsion he calls the *élan vitale* or life impetus. This stamps him at once as a vitalist but not a vitalist in the sense of the old teleology of the type of Agassiz, which is often called finalism. He condemns finalism as much as the mechanistic theory. According to him life is not bound by any prearranged plan, but is free at all times to modify its course

and change its direction. Life according to this view is like a rocket bursting as it flies, each fragment again bursting and so on. The life impetus is thus continually dividing. Just as the bursting of the rocket depends upon the explosive force of the powder and the resistance of the surrounding mantle so the direction of life depends upon the unstable balance of tendencies which it bears within itself and the resistance it meets with from inert matter. "It is as if the vital impetus were trying to graft on the invariableness of matter the largest possible amount of instability." Already, in fact, the latest theory of evolution, Mendelism or the theory of sudden variations called mutations, expounded by De Vries and his school, is modifying Darwinism profoundly on this point. For, it asserts that at a given moment, after a long period the entire species is beset with a tendency to change. The tendency to change is therefore not accidental. The change itself, indeed, would be accidental, at least so far as the limited experiments on the Evening Primrose by De Vries have shown, but these Neo-Darwinians are clearly inclined to admit that the periods of mutation are determinate, and so may also be the direction of the mutation. This admission brings us to Eimer's hypothesis, expounded in his *Organic Evolution*, according to which the variations of different characters continue from generation to generation in definite directions. But while Eimer holds that such variations are solely due to combinations of physical and chemical causes Bergson interjects a psychological cause, the spontaneity of life which is partly determinate and partly indeterminate, otherwise, he claims, the likeness of the structure of the eye in species which have not the same history as that of the common Pecten and of man cannot be explained. Indeed, the oldest school of Evolutionists, the followers of Lamarck, resort to a cause of a psychological nature. Lamarck taught that new species arise partly through use and disuse of its organs under the influence of environment and his disciples insist more and more that characters acquired during the lifetime of an individual are transmitted to its offspring, a claim

which is utterly denied by the Darwinians. The variation that results in a new species is not, the Lamarckians say, merely an accidental variation inherent in the germ itself, nor is it governed by a determinism *sui generis* which develops definite characters in a definite direction, apart from every consideration of utility. It springs from the very effort of the living being to adapt itself to the circumstances of its existence. This effort may either be only mechanical or imply consciousness and will. Bergson, therefore, claims that Neo-Lamarckism is of all the later forms of evolutionism the only one capable of admitting an internal and psychological principle of development, although it is not bound to do so. But, he adds, if this cause is nothing but the conscious effort of the individual, it cannot operate in more than a restricted number of cases,—at most in the animal world and not at all in the vegetable kingdom. And even then it could only compass an increase of complexity if the acquired characters were regularly transmitted and accumulated which, however, is the exception rather than the rule. But such a complex hereditary change in a definite direction must require an effort inherent in the germs of most representatives of a species and assured of being passed on to their descendants, this effort is the Bergsonian original impetus of life passing from one generation of germs to the following generation of germs through the developed organisms which bridge the interval between the generations. According to this view of creative evolution neither the Darwinian factor of slow or rapid variation by natural selection nor the Lamarckian factor of environment are the causes of new species, they only explain “the sinuosities of the courses of evolution” but not the general direction and still less the causes of the movement itself. Nor does the doctrine of finality prove adequate, when it likens the labor of nature to that of a workman who assembles material and tools in order to carry out an idea or to imitate a model. “Life does not proceed,” Bergson says, “by the association and addition of elements but by dissociation and division,” as a mere glance at the develop-

ment of an embryo shows, proceeding from the homogeneous egg to the heterogeneous body. Moreover, a plan is given in advance. It is represented or at least representable before its realization. The complete execution may be put off to a distant future, or even indefinitely; but the idea is nevertheless formulable at the present time in terms actually given. If, on the contrary, evolution is a creation unceasingly renewed, it creates as it goes on, not only the forms of life, but the ideas that will enable the intellect to understand it, the terms which will serve to express it. That is to say that its future overflows its present and cannot be sketched out therein in an idea. Furthermore, if life realizes a plan, it ought to manifest a greater harmony the farther it advances, just as a house shows better and better the idea of the architect as stone is set upon stone. If, on the contrary, the unity of life is to be found solely in the impetus that pushes it along the road of time the harmony is not in front but behind, it is given at the start as an impulsion and not placed at the end as an attraction. In communicating itself the impetus splits up more and more. Life in proportion to its progress is scattered in manifestations complementary to each other in the beginning but none the less mutually incompatible and antagonistic. So the discord between species is ever increasing both progressively and retrogressively for the same causes that divide the evolution movement cause life to be diverted from itself, hypnotized by the form it has just brought forth.

Now the way life breaks into individuals and species after the fashion of the bursting rocket spoken of above depends on two series of causes: the resistance life meets from inert matter and the explosive force due to an unstable balance of tendencies—which life bears within itself. It is interesting to note in this connection that Bergson opens up an entirely new view on the relations of vegetable, animal and human life. He points out the error which ever since Aristotle has vitiated the general theory of evolution, viz., the theory that these three categories of life are three successive stages of a single process,

which developed from below upward, *i. e.*, from unconscious life to instinct and from instinct to intelligence. This pernicious dogma, he says, has more or less influenced all philosophical systems. "*The cardinal error which from Aristotle onwards, has vitiated most of the philosophies of nature, is to see in vegetative, instinctive and rational life, three successive degrees of the development of one and the same tendency, whereas they are three divergent directions of an activity that has split up as it grew. The difference between them is not a difference of intensity, nor, more generally, of degree, but of kind.*" This is the central and chief thought of the whole work on "*Creative Evolution.*"

The first problem confronting this vital impetus as it enters matter is somewhere to gather energy with which to counteract the retarding force of matter. As a matter of fact, the principal source of energy usable on the surface of our planet is the sun. So the problem for life was this: to accumulate the sun's energy in suitable reservoir so that it could be drawn upon at the desired moment, at the desired spot, in the desired direction, *i. e.*, for any need such as movement and reproduction. The substances forming the food of animal are just such substances. They are, in the form of starch fat and proteids, complex molecules holding a considerable amount of potential energy, resembling explosives which only need a spark to set free the energy within them. No doubt the first living beings had the power of taking from the inorganic environment simple compounds which by means of the sun's rays were decomposed and recombined again into complex molecules only to be utilized again by life; in other words the first organism manufactured the explosive and caused the explosion in order to utilize it. Such a being we still have in the *Euglena*, a chlorophyll-bearing Protozoan which in a rather crude way symbolizes this primordial tendency. This organism expends kinetic energy in motion like any animal but at the same time stores up potential energy by means of the sun's rays acting on its chlorophyll content after the fashion of plants. In the course

of time these two tendencies could not be kept united in the same living being as a single tendency and two divergent lines of development opened up, the one culminated in the vegetable life and the other in the animal life. But if nature had for its object from the first the explosion rather than the explosive, which was merely the means to an end, then the animal indicates the direction of life. The latter evolved toward a freer and freer expenditure of discontinuous energy, the former perfected rather its system of accumulation without moving. These two tendencies were opposed in certain points and complementary in others but preserved an appearance of kinship. Wherever there is division of labor there is also association and convergence of effort. But creative evolution is never achieved by association but by dissociation; it never tends toward convergence but toward divergence. The result of the two different methods of food getting was that the plant surrounded itself with a hard coat of cellulose, which is rather impenetrable to external stimuli and therefore prevents even a low degree of conscious response or consciousness, while the animal cell in its search for food cannot encase itself completely and therefore readily responds to external stimuli and thus develops an ever higher type of consciousness. Bergson claims an obvious relationship between mobility and consciousness, but at the same time cautions against radical distinctions between unconscious and conscious, as being two labels which can be mechanically fastened, the one on every vegetable cell, the other on all animals. While consciousness sleeps in the animal which has degenerated into a motionless parasite it probably awakens in the vegetable that has regained liberty of movement. Nevertheless consciousness and unconsciousness mark the directions in which the two kingdoms have developed, becoming most perfect in the highest animals while in the vegetable kingdom it is only found in the very lowest and simplest forms, such as the algæ, "The humblest organism is conscious in proportion to its power to move freely." But the two characteristic tendencies of the two kingdoms although divergent coexist even

now both in plant and in the animal. However active an animal species may be torpor and consciousness are always lying in wait for it. It keeps up the rôle only by effort, at the price of fatigue. The history of evolution shows many retrogressions, but the vital impulse has again and again aroused the animal to move forward, so especially during the middle palæozoic, when the molluscs had a shell more universally than those of to-day and the arthropods in general were provided with a carapace and the more ancient fish had a bony sheath of extreme hardness. But the impulse of life got the upper hand again in two directions, the fishes exchanged their ganoid breast plate for scales and the insects had appeared void of the breast plate of their ancestors, increasing thereby mobility and suppleness and also variety of movements. This again took place in divergent directions. In the arthropods motor activity is distributed amongst a varying number of specialized appendages. In the vertebrates it is concentrated in two pairs only, the functions of which are more or less independent of their form, becoming completely independent in man whose hand is capable of any kind of work. But behind these differences in form and motion two powers may be surmised, immanent in life and originally intermingled, which were bound to part company in course of growth. These two powers reach their culmination in the arthropods and vertebrates respectively. These two powers are instinct and intelligence, the one culminating in the hymenopterous insects and the other in man. Vegetative torpor, instinct and intelligence are the elements which resided in the vital impulsion common to plants and animals, and which in the course of a heterogeneous development have been dissociated by the very fact of their growth. Now just as plant life and animal life are at once mutually complementary and mutually antagonistic so are also intelligence and instinct opposite end complementary. "Instinct perfected is a faculty of using and even of constructing organized instruments; intelligence perfected is the faculty of making and using unorganized instruments." Man appeared first

on earth when the first weapons, the first tools were made. Now there are some acts performed by animals which we call intelligent, for example the fox's ability to recognize a trap, but it is after all only the beginning of intelligence in the form of inference; however, inference is the beginning of invention and invention becomes only complete when it is materialized in a manufactured instrument. That is the ideal of animal intelligence. On the other hand, if instinct consists in the natural ability to use an inborn mechanism where does the activity of instinct begin and where does that of a mere vital process end? We cannot tell. The labor of feeding, reproduction and preservation is the activity of nature while the division of the labor of feeding, reproduction and preservation as carried on among bees and ants is instinct. But originally both intelligence and instinct were contained in the same psychical activity, they had to separate in order to grow. Both developed into fundamentally different kinds of knowledge. When the horse fly lays its eggs on the legs or shoulders of the horse, it acts as if it knew that the larva has to develop in the horse's stomach and that the horse in licking itself will convey the larva into its digestive tract. The knowledge, if knowledge there be, is only implicit. It is reflected outwardly in exact movements instead of being reflected inwardly in consciousness, but it is nevertheless true that the behavior of the insect involves or rather evolves the idea of definite things existing or being produced in definite points of space and time which the insect knows without having learned them. So much for instinctive action. In contrast to this a new born babe with its innate intelligence, although it is a faculty of knowing, knows no object in particular nor a definite property of an object, but when a little later on, he will hear an epithet being applied to a substantive, he will immediately understand what it means. The relation of attribute to subject is therefore seized by him naturally and the same might be said of the general relation expressed by the verb. In short innate instinct refers to things or actions, innate intelligence to relations. "Intelligence is

the knowledge of form, instinct implies the knowledge of matter." Instinct is therefore limited, intelligence is unlimited and capable to go beyond itself. There are things for which intelligence would like to search but which it cannot find alone, instinct might find them but it will never seek them. The difficulty in finding a proper explanation for instinctive action comes from our habit of trying to express instinctive knowledge through the language of intelligence. It is absurd to imagine that an insect should have the same knowledge of its victim which it stings to death as a naturalist who observes both animals from without. But the difficulty disappears, according to Bergson, if one assumes a certain sympathy, in the etymological sense of the word, between the insect and its victim, which would teach the insect from within the vulnerability of its victim. This is a sort of divining sympathy more experienced than comprehended. If this sympathy would be capable of extending beyond its object and lead to a self-examination it would give us the key to the fundamental questions of life. For the one tendency is at home in the sphere of dead matter and the other in the realm of life. Intelligence will reveal to us in the course of time all the secrets of the physical phenomena, of life itself it can only give us a translation in terms of inertia. It goes all around life, taking form outside the greatest possible number of views of it, drawing it into itself instead of entering into it. But it is to the very inwardness of life that intuition leads us—by intuition, Bergson means instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and enlarging it indefinitely. That such a desire is not impossible is shown by the presence in man of an esthetic faculty along with normal perception. The artist by an effort of intuition breaks down the barrier that space puts between him and his model and placing himself within the object by a kind of sympathy he can reproduce the real character of his model through the lines on his canvas. Intuition thus may enable us to grasp what intelligence fails to give us. It may bring the intellect to recognize that neither

mechanical causality nor finality can give a sufficient interpretation of the vital process. Then by sympathetic communication which it establishes between us and the rest of the living, by the expansion of our consciousness which it brings about, it introduces us into life's domain which is reciprocal interpenetration, endlessly continued creation. But though it transcends intelligence it is from intelligence that has come the push that has made it rise to the point it has reached. Now, if consciousness has thus split up into intuition and intelligence, it is because of the need it had to apply itself to matter at the same time as it had to follow the stream of life. Any theory of knowledge, any normal philosophy must take account of these two faculties and give them the place which rightfully belongs to them. It is only by dwelling on this opposition of the two elements and on this identity of origin, that we shall bring out more clearly the meaning of evolution itself.

The preceding discussions throw a new light upon the highest and most important problem in metaphysics, viz., the origin and evolution of the universe. Bergson's idea of intuition permits us to go beyond the limits of exact science and to lift the veil which hides the riddle of the universe. Here too the "*élan vitale*," the vital impulse, plays the chief rôle. As Lotze before him so Bergson maintains that there is life also in material nature. Lotze, too, speaks of formative forces, of forces of innate unexpected efficiency, etc. Only with him this force is more of a reciprocal action and reaction. With Bergson it is the creative, interpenetrating force which lives in the universe and according to which the universe develops. What is its importance? It is not pure mechanism nor causality or mere blind force. But this innate impulse is in its course of unfolding impeded by the resistance of matter. It flows like a broad mighty river of life through the cosmos, it is a tendency to create life. This tendency includes an infinite number of possibilities. In its irresistible course it has given matter a definite form and brought it into organic existence. However in this very combat with matter its motion has become

slower and its course has divided into numberless branches. On the one hand consciousness has fallen asleep in the plant world, on the other hand infinite possibilities have been gloriously realized in the animal kingdom. Among the animals consciousness has become instinct; in man it has become intelligence. But both are parallel phenomena, reaching their culmination in the insects and in man respectively.

The primeval force which has been flowing through the world for hundreds of millions of years is nevertheless a limited force which ever tends to go beyond itself and yet ever remains inadequate to the work which it strives to produce. This important point is constantly overlooked by teleologists, which look upon the world as a harmonious whole in which discords only serve to bring out the fundamental harmony. But who has not actually experienced the disproportions between the original ideals and plans of any work and its actual results. There is a single gigantic effort to be observed in the whole organic world, an effort to soar on high, but must frequently the effort fails. Opposing forces either impede it or it stops in a crippled condition as though hypnotized. Even in the most perfect forms of animal life the "élan vitale" is exposed to the retarding influence of matter. Our own freedom is apt to stagnate in habits unless renewed by constantly new efforts. The living thought becomes a dead formula, the word kills the idea, the letter crushes the spirit. Whence this inevitable opposition? Only the origin of life, especially of human life, can explain it. When the river of life meets the counter-current of matter it is converted into a vortex. The "élan vitale" is impeded, stopped and for a shorter or longer time fixed. It must obey matter for a certain period of time and the pernicious power of mechanism becomes the ruling element but it never stops it altogether. For at a single stage of this life process the life impetus has succeeded in breaking through the mechanistic torpor, viz., at the stage of humanity. This link in the endless chain of life has wrenched itself loose from the fetters of a torpid determinism. Man is at the same time

both instinct and intelligence. Unfortunately the former has been pushed back by the greater power of the latter but it has not been annihilated. Intuition is perhaps given to all men to a very small degree but for the select few it becomes a light in their struggle on the strong dark road which leads to truth. Only intuition can enlighten our emotions when intelligence fails.

The "élan vitale" permeating the universe is consciousness. It contains as every consciousness an infinite number of efficacious interpenetrating forces which belong neither to the category of unity nor to that of plurality because these categories have been created for inert matter. Matter alone can divide this flood into separate branches or individualities. The stream of life therefore flows through all human generations and divides into individuals through the influence of matter. Thus souls are continually created which nevertheless in a certain sense preëxisted. They are nothing else than the little rills into which the great river of life divides itself, flowing through the body of humanity. The movement of the stream is distinct from the river bed although it must adopt its winding course. Consciousness is distinct from the organism it animates although it must undergo its vicissitudes. As the possible actions which a state of consciousness indicates are at every instant the motor indications of the state of consciousness but the interdependency of brain and consciousness is limited to this; the destiny of consciousness is not bound up on that account with the density of cerebral matter. Finally consciousness is essentially free; it is freedom itself; but it cannot pass through matter without settling on it, without adapting itself to it; this adaptability Bergson calls intellectuality. And the intellect forces the active, *i. e.*, free consciousness to adapt itself to the frame to which it is accustomed to see matter subjected. The intellect will therefore always see freedom in the form of necessity and overlook what is new and creative in a free act. The intellect has no appreciation for freedom, therefore the apparent success of determinism. However, the

metaphysician who desires to place intuition into its rightful place sees many difficulties vanish or become light. Such a philosophy not only facilitates speculation but is also of vast ethical significance. It gives us, says Bergson, more power to act and to live. For with it, we feel ourselves no longer isolated in humanity; humanity no longer seems isolated in the nature that it dominates. Just as the smallest grain of dust is dependent upon our entire solar system so all organized beings from the humblest to the highest manifest at all places and times but a single impulsion opposed to the movement of matter and in itself indivisible. To obey this impulse of creative, nay divine activity consciously but not slavishly should be the goal of every clear headed man.

Bergson would like to regenerate all practical life and endow it with a higher and nobler sense. Only he who lives in and by intuition is really free and truly creative. Therefore should we all strive to live in and through intuition and to contrôle and lay aside the material in us. Above all it is necessary that our will should be reborn. We must free ourselves from the blind necessity of our wants and from its slave the intellect by an act of our will. Bergson therefore places freedom of action above mere phenomena, above the intellect. This philosophy culminates in the imperative. But here the biologist is stronger in him than the metaphysician. To him the will is nothing more than a biological "a priori" and the intellect only a biological "a posteriori." If we want to return from the latter to the former we are forced to retrace our whole development. The highest aim would be to combine harmoniously the two different forms of intuition and of intellect at which Fichte already aimed in order to reach the most perfect stage in the development of humanity.

Bergson's views thus ultimately rest on a practical voluntaristic principle, the will to intuition, an intuition which, somewhat after Kant's intuitive intellect, is to behold the realm of freedom and the realm of necessity in harmonious communion. It resembles, according to Bergson, the artist's fancy and stamps

the organic life as the world life, the absolute. There is therefore not a single isolated being in the whole universe. All living beings are more or less related, all yield to one and the same tremendous push. "The animal takes its stand on the plant, man bestrides animality, and the whole of humanity in space and in time is one immense army galloping beside and before and behind each of us in an overwhelming charge able to beat down every resistance and clear the most formidable obstacles, perhaps even death."

In a second article we shall endeavor to subject Bergson's philosophy to a closer scrutiny and criticism and contrast it with modern biological thinking and the Christian faith.

LANCASTER, PA.

II.

WALTER SCOTT: POET.

W. U. HENSEL.

NOTE.—*Editor Review.* When I was a college student nearly fifty years ago the library resources of the institutions were very much more limited than they are now. Nevertheless, we read on an average two or three standard books every week. The Bible and Shakespeare were the familiar English classics; and I think Cooper, Hawthorne, Scott, Thackeray and Dickens were favorites in fiction; Scott, Byron, Keats and Shelley, of the English poets; Poe, Lowell, Bryant, Longfellow and Whittier, of the American; Addison and Carlyle, Emerson and Holmes, of the essayists and masters of prose style, were acquaintances of the average Sophomore. In a recent conversation with a fairly scholarly student of an upper class, I was startled to find that about one volume of polite literature per month was now considered a fair average accomplishment. He informed me that while he had read one or two of Sir Walter's novels, he had no idea that Scott was ranked as a poet. Hence I went back to some of my early literary associations to satisfy myself that I had not grievously erred and wasted my time reading and memorizing so much of his verse. Wherefore this contribution.

W. U. H.

There is a manifest tendency in certain quarters to depreciate, if not to deny, the claims of Walter Scott's admirers to his rank as a poet. Mine is not the purpose to undertake a critique of his works or an analysis of his genius. He occupies such a large space in the history of English literature, his creations are so manifold, his versatility so remarkable and his personality so picturesque, that the passing moment would not compass so vast a subject—or rather so many themes. It is doubtful if within the whole range, from Chaucer to Noyes, a more cheerful and robust figure, a more prolific and unflagging industry, a more wholesome and abiding influence have manifested themselves in the literature of our race and tongue.

He was not the founder of a school, nor the herald of a new

era in letters. The classic age had preceded him, when Addison and Swift, Goldsmith and Sterne gave elegance to the English essay; Richardson, Fielding and Smollet gave form and characteristics to the English novel; and Pope and Gray gave eloquence and rhetoric to English poetry.

A compatriot, preceding him, a ruddy Scotch peasant, with the soil of the furrow yet on his garments, when he dazzled the drawing rooms of Edinburgh, had already wrought a revolution in letters as surely as on the other side of the channel the torch and axe had worked social and political revolution and established the rights of man. Near the close of the eighteenth and in the dawn of the nineteenth century, as Taine puts it, "The human mind turned on its hinges and so did civil society."

Scott, who lived after Burns, died before the Victorian reign began, with its splendid burst of letters, its poets, novelists, scientists, philosophers and historians. They made it a many-sided epoch, more lustrous in a galaxy of shining names than any previous period of six decades. The first half of the nineteenth century witnessed the rise and reign of many brilliant names in English letters. Though yet the dawn of modern life and manners, it saw the entrance of history and philosophy into literature; and as Wordsworth, Shelley and Coleridge were the exponents of the one idea, Scott made manifest the other. The revolution in taste which substituted romantic sentiments and subjects for the classical culminated in his poems. These preceded the great series of prose fictions known as *The Waverly Novels*—and they formed an epoch in the history of modern literature, notwithstanding current slighting allusions to Scott's claim to be a poet and flippant suggestions that his longer poems are merely rhymed-tales, and his songs and ballads only "little exercises in mediocre verse."

It is needless to discuss the relative rank and usefulness of the critic and the poet. Matthew Arnold quotes with emphatic approval Wordsworth's judgment that the critical power is infinitely lower than the inventive—and he said "that if the

quantity of time consumed in writing critiques on the works of others were given to original composition, of whatever kind it might be, it would be much better employed; it would make a man find out sooner his own level, and it would do infinitely less mischief. A false or malicious criticism may do much injury to the minds of others, a stupid invention, either in prose or verse, is quite harmless."

It would, however, be obviously unfair to say, if Walter Scott was not a poet, show us one—or, if "*Marmion*," and "*The Lay*," and "*The Lady of the Lake*," and "*Young Lochinvar*" are not poems, write us one. It is an easy thing to say, with Poe, that a long poem does not exist; "it is simply a flat contradiction in terms"; or as true art is never didactic, a poem that teaches a lesson is not a poem; or tales must be relegated to history, and therefore no rhymed narrative can be a poem—and thus dispose of the question by begging it at the outset.

But if we even accept Poe's own definition that a poem deserves its title in the ratio of its power to excite by elevating the soul; that the poetry of words is the rhythmical creation of beauty, but that while this must be the atmosphere and real essence of the poem, there may yet be introduced the incitements of passion, the precepts of duty, or even the lessons of truth, and of course the events of history, it may fairly be contended that Scott was a true and a great poet; that he well deserved to follow Burns in the primacy of his own time and to precede Byron; that his poetic works alone would have given him imperishable fame; and that when Byron said "*Sir Walter reigned before me*," he spake prophecy as well as truth.

Mr. Lockhart's ten ponderous volumes supply all the facts of Scott's life and career, with such amplitude that the curious may delve there indefinitely to determine what parts, respectively, heredity, genius and environment had in forming his poetic powers. But if he did come from "a riding, sporting and fighting clan," it may have been a happy fortune that made him a sickly child, a lame youth and a not wholly successful lawyer. His habit as a boy of lying on the turf among

the sheep and lambs gave his mind a tenderness for animals which was ever retained and is one of the distinguishing features of his poetry. The lad who was found by his affrighted aunt exulting in the wild thunder storms and shouting "bonny, bonny" at every flash of lightning; the school boy whose head was "on fire for chivalry," who hated Whigs and Presbyterians; the youth who on his sick bed arranged shells, seeds and pebbles to represent encountering armies; who read all he could get in the direction of military exploit, mediæval romance and legend, ballad and border song, was alike by birth, taste and education, certain to soon hear the trumpet call to such achievements in poetic literature as are sounded in this quatrain, key note of his character and career:

"Sound, sound the clarion, fill the fife,
To all the sensual world proclaim,
One crowded hour of glorious life
Is worth a world without a name."

A complete volume of his poetical works, with his essays on ballads and minstrelsy, his introductions and notes, comprises nearly a thousand octavo pages. Many of these are taken, however, from his novels; in nearly every one of them, in introductory verse, lyric compositions, epitaphs, mottoes and varied bits of poesy he proves that the hand which swept the minstrel harp earlier in his career, had not been wholly cramped by the pen which performed such prodigious labors in the later fields of prose.

In *Waverley*, for example, Davie answers with the song of Lady Rose:

"But follow, follow me
While glow worms light the lea,
I'll show you where the dead should be,
Each in his shroud,
While winds pipe loud.
And the red moon peeps dim through the cloud.

"Follow me, follow me,
Brave should he be
That treads by the night the dead man's lea."

The weird songs of "Meg Merrilles," in *Guy Mannering* are only equalled by the wild and doleful ballad of "Elsbeth" in the *Antiquary*. Throughout this work some of the most exquisite verses from his pen are ascribed in the chapter headings to the fanciful "Old Play," or "Old Ballad." Recall these lines from Major Bellenden's song in "Old Mortality":

"For time will rust the brightest blade,
And years will break the strongest bow,"
Was never wight so strongly made,
But time and years would overthrow."

Again he ascribes this motto to imaginary "James Duff"—lines which are strongly suggestive of passages in that stirring hymn "The Son of God Goes Forth to War":

"Arouse thee youth—it is no common call.
God's church is leagured—haste to man the wall.
Haste where the Red Cross banners wave on high,
Signals of honored death or victory."

In "Rob Roy" he makes one of his characters introduce and another speak slightly of those stirring lines to the memory of "Edward the Black Prince," beginning:

"Oh, for the voice of that wild horn
On Fontarabian echoes borne"—

a couplet by the way that he introduces in one of his more extended poems.

Nearly a score of Madge Wildfire's songs in "The Heart of Midlothian" are Scott's own compositions; and most of the mottoes ascribed to "Watt's Hymns" and to various less known sources are only his own clever inventions. None of his prose fiction so abounds with such compositions as "Ivanhoe," where "The Crusader's Return," "The Barefooted Friar," "The Saxon War Song" and "The Funeral Dirge" are only less notable because of the preëminent merit of Rebecca's Hymn. I may be pardoned for quoting at length this splendid tribute to a race who "severed from other men, yet boast their intercourse with human arts."

"When Israel, of the Lord beloved,
 Out from the land of bondage came,
 Her fathers' God before her moved,
 An awful guide in smoke and flame.
 By day, along the astonish'd lands
 The cloudy pillar glided slow;
 By night, Arabia's crimson'd sands
 Return'd the fiery column's glow.

"There rose the choral hymn of praise,
 And trump and timbrel answer'd keen,
 And Zion's daughters pour'd their lays,
 With priest's and warrior's voice between.
 No portents now our foes amaze,
 Forsaken Israel wanders lone:
 Our fathers would not know Thy ways,
 And Thou hast left them to their own.

"But present still, though now unseen!
 When brightly shines the prosperous day,
 Be thoughts of Thee a cloudy screen
 To temper the deceitful ray.
 And oh, when stoops on Judah's path
 In shade and storm the frequent night,
 Be Thou, long-suffering, slow to wrath,
 A burning and a shining light!

"Our harps we left by Babel's streams,
 The tyrant's jest, the Gentile's scorn;
 No censer round our altar beams,
 And mute are timbrel, harp, and horn.
 But Thou hast said, The blood of goat,
 The flesh of rams I will not prize;
 A contrite heart, a humble thought,
 Are mine accepted sacrifice."

The "Owl Song" in *Kenilworth*, instigated by "Mine Host," and, we may well believe, received by favor with his guests, is in a different key:

"The lark is but a bumpkin fowl,
 He sleeps in his nest till morn;
 But my blessing upon the jolly owl
 That all night blows his horn.
 Then up with your cup till you stagger in speech,
 And match me this catch, till you swagger and screech,
 And drink till you wink, my merry men each;
 For, though hours be late, and weather be foul,
 We'll drink to the health of the bonny, bonny owl."

In "The Pirate," he ascribes these lines to "an old song," but he was certainly the first to sing it:

"Over the mountains and under the waves,
Over the fountains and under the graves,
Over floods that are deepest,
Which Neptune obey,
Over rocks that are steepest,
Love will find out the way."

In his later novels, the habit increases of appending quaint and often exquisite mottoes, generally rhymed or in blank verse, as headings to his chapters; no later imitator has ever approached him in the excellence of this literary device. Had he written only the verse that has been woven into his prose works, Scott could not have been ranked as an inferior poet.

But it is, of course, by his longer and what has been derided as "sustained effort" that he attained the great vogue which rewarded his earlier labors in the realm of poesy. In these modern days of enormous editions and vociferous, but transitory, literary popularity, we are apt to be suspicious of a book that everybody reads, or of an author that is bought up by the hundred thousand before publication. Yet, even in these days of Gilbert Parker, Bertha Runkle, Mary Johnston or Winston Churchill, it is difficult to conceive what has been called "the rapture of enthusiasm with which the public received the rapid and dazzling succession of Scott's poems." It has never had a parallel in the history of literature, except when he burst forth with the splendor and fertility of his prose romances. When his bust was placed in Westminster Abbey some years ago, our then Ambassador to England, John Hay, delivered an address, in which, with a few brilliant strokes, he pictured most felicitously the enthusiasm of the New West over each recurring publication of Scott's poems and novels. Of the men and women who experienced these emotions, few are now living, but a sense of filial duty prompts one to try and vindicate the soundness of their judgment. Within less than ten years, the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," "Marmion," "The

Lady of the Lake," "Rokeby," "Lord of the Isles," "Vision of Sir Roderick," "The Bridal of Triermain" and "Harold the Dauntless," all were written and published, not to mention various lyrical and miscellaneous pieces and some vivid translations.

It may not be uninteresting to note that an individual exception to the popularity of his work was the effect produced upon his lady love, Miss Stuart Belches. Upon being presented with a specially printed, blazoned and bound copy of his translation of a violent German spectre ballad, she promptly declined a suitor who seemed to revel in ghostly wedding journeys and skeleton bridals. Under no other circumstances, perhaps, would she have been heedless of the vividness of his spectre horsemanship:

"Tramp, tramp along the road,
Splash, splash along the sea,
The scourge is red, the spur drops blood,
The flashing pebbles flee."

He was not a callow genius, nor a "wondrous boy." He was nearly thirty-two when he wrote the first of "The Lay of the Last Minstrel," and thirty-four when it was published entire. He admits, in an account of the literary history of it nearly thirty years later, that he dipped what he calls his "desperate pen" into ink for other purposes than those of the legal profession, because he desired to make honorable provision for the rising family of which he had become head. Against the popular aversion to "pot-boilers" in art or literature, it was pleasing to read, in a popular magazine some years ago, a concession that "some of the greatest work in the world has had its origin in the necessity of having three meals a day, or at least two. Certainly, the impulse of the money consideration cannot make an artist; but, on the other hand, it is a poor artist that it can spoil, while it has been the means of discovering a many a one to himself." "We must acknowledge," says the same writer, "the legitimacy of the motive, and acknowl-

edge that a man may write for money without impairing the artistic quality of his work,—indeed, even with a dignity of the sort that comes from fulfilling a fundamental duty to himself and others.” “*Marmion*” was rated at a thousand guineas before it was published. The copyright of the “*Lord of the Isles*” was valued at \$15,000. At the same time, Scott says he resolved that literature should be his staff and not his crutch.

Most happily for his fame and popularity, Scott adopted a measure which forms the structure of so much minstrel poetry that he calls it the “*Romantic stanza*.” It is no discredit to the literary-poetic quality of his poetry to say that its form has most happily adapted it to popularity. Readily learned and easily retained, his rhythm abides long and firmly in the memory. Mr. Lowell suggests somewhere as a test of a classic that it must “*maintain itself*.” Judged by this canon of criticism, Scott’s merit is indisputable. The ballad of “*Cadyow Castle*” made so strong an impression on Thomas Campbell that, referring to certain stanzas, he says: “I have repeated them so often on the North Bridge that the whole fraternity of coachmen know me by tongue as I pass. To be sure, to a mind in sober, serious, street-walking humor, it must bear an appearance of lunacy when one stamps with the hurried pace and fervid shake of the head which strong, pithy poetry excites.”

Sir Walter himself, in one of his diaries, says: “I am sensible that, if there be any good about my poetry, or prose either, it is a hurried frankness of composition, which pleases soldiers, sailors, young people of bold and active dispositions.” Mr. Richard H. Hutton, in his brief biography, and Lockhart, in his *Life*, bear the same testimony. Hutton says: “I have heard of two old men—complete strangers—passing each other on a dark London night, when one of them happened to be repeating to himself, just as Campbell did to the hackney coachmen of the North Bridge of Edinburgh, the last lines of the account of Flodden Field in ‘*Marmion*,’—‘Charge,

Chester, charge,' when suddenly a reply came out of the darkness, 'On, Stanley, on,' whereupon they finished the death of Marmion between them, took off their hats to each other, and parted, laughing." "Scott's is almost the only poetry in the English language that not only runs thus in the head of average men, but heats the head in which it runs by the mere force of its hurried frankness of style, to use Scott's own terms, or by that of its strong and pithy eloquence, as Campbell phrased it. And in 'Cadyow Castle' this style is at its culminating point."

No poet of a modern language has ever acquired such popular currency. The uncultured auditor paid a high compliment to Hamlet when he complained that its author indulged in too many familiar sayings. If you will take down your dust-covered books of poetical quotations, you will find manifold evidence of his popularity, and will, perhaps, be reminded that you had not always given him credit for such familiar couplets as these:

"I cannot tell how the truth may be;
I say the tale as 'twas told to me."

Or,

"Her blue eyes sought the west afar,
For lovers love the western star."

Or,

"True love is the gift which God has given
To man alone beneath the Heaven."

Or,

"Just at the age twixt boy and youth
When thought is speech and speech is truth."

Or,

"When Prussia hurried to the field
And snatched the spear but left the field."

Or,

"But woe awaits a country when
She sees the tears of bearded men."

Or,

"Oh what a tangled web we weave
When first we practice to deceive."

The late Charles A. Dana, a gentleman of most excellent literary taste, nearly forty years ago, published an anthology on English poetry, comprising the most beautiful and admirable among the minor poems of the language; he included ten of Scott's short poems. I have heard, in the barrooms of rural taverns on long winter nights, in the gatherings of a country store, under the orchard trees or on the barn bridge of a remote farm, old men recite page after page of Scott, with a familiarity that attaches to no other author. The French critic Taine, speaking of his novels as well as his poems, says: "He has given to Scotland a citizenship of literature—I mean to the whole of Scotland; scenery, monuments, houses, cottages, characters of every age and condition, from the baron to the fisherman, from the advocate to the beggar, from the lady to the fishwife. When we mention merely his name, they crowd forward; who does not see them coming from every niche of memory?"

I recall, with much interest, an incident illustrative of this, occurring nearly twenty-five years ago. There is a very long poem, written in Scott's style, by one Charles Swaim, entitled "Dryburgh Abbey." It represents the author musing in the twilight over Scott's tomb, when there passes through his fancy a cavalcade of the personage to whom his lively pen has given flesh, blood and verity. It is a remarkable piece of work. Securing the latter half of it many years ago, and being unable to procure the first part, I published what was in my possession, with an inquiry for the remainder, when a once distinguished citizen of Lancaster wrote me that, if I would call upon him (his residence then being at the County Almshouse), he would furnish me with the remainder, and, to my great delight, he was able to repeat from memory the entire poem, which I have not seen re-published for nearly a quarter of a century.

In fervid political oratory, few authors supply such fitness of quotation. How could an ejected contestant in a political convention retire with more dramatic effect than by reciting the defiant passage,

“I go, but when I come again,
I’ll come with banners, band and men.”

The late William B. Mann, lawyer, politician and noted forensic orator of Philadelphia, was very ready to garnish his fine speeches with gems from Scott. A most striking quotation was by the late Senator Quay, in his eulogy on Ex-Speaker Samuel J. Randall, in the United States Senate, when he gave the lines:

“I’d give the lands of Deloraine,
Dark Musgrave were come back again.”

William Pitt, who was probably the equal of Mr. Quay as a statesman (and scarcely inferior to him as a scholar), declared that the lines in which Scott depicts the Old Minstrel’s embarrassment at being asked to play, produced an effect which Pitt could only have expected to find in painting and to which he had theretofore deemed poetry wholly inadequate.

His personages are declared to be like the figures of *Salvator Rosa* in his landscapes, where the brigands owe their impressiveness to the magnificent background of rock and waterfall. The fire and energy of the “*Lay of the Last Minstrel*”: “who tuned to please a peasant’s ear, the harp a king had loved to hear,” translate the reader into the fourteenth century. In “*Marmion*,” the description of the battle is pronounced hardly inferior to Homer, while in “*The Lady of the Lake*,” the magic descriptions of Scottish scenery have made Loch Katrine, Ben Lomond and the Trossachs veritable pilgrim shrines. Macaulay says: “The glamour of the great poet’s genius has forever hallowed, not only the nature thus first shown in all its loveliness to the curiosity of the world, but even the barbarous tribes whose manners Scott has invested with all the charms of fiction.”

He was notably graphic and thrilling in his battle scenes and descriptions of warfare; in depicting the chase; in delineating personal bravery, courtesy and chivalry; in his tributes to the fidelity of horses and dogs; in inspiring love of country and locality, and in his pictures of natural scenery.

Well worthy to stand with such ringing battle ballads as Campbell's "Hohenlinden," Tennyson's "Light Brigade," O'Hara's "Bivouac of the Dead," Burns' "Bannockburn," Bryant's "Battlefield," or Thompson's "High Tide at Gettysburg," are Walter Scott's "Bonnets of Bonny Dundee," "Pibroch of Donuil Dhu," or, finer than either, the "Battle of Flodden" and the combat in "Marmion,"—the first notes of which reach us in the fourth canto, when "mingled trump and clamor loud, and fife and kettledrum, and sackbut deep and psaltery, and war pipe with discordant cry, and cymbal clattering to the sky, making wild music bold and high, did up the mountain come." And this:

"At length the freshening western blast
 Aside the shroud of battle cast;
 And, first, the ridge of mingled spears
 Above the brightening cloud appears;
 And in the smoke the pennons flew,
 As in the storm the white sea-mew.
 Then mark'd they, dashing broad and far,
 The broken billows of the war,
 And plumed crests of chieftains brave,
 Floating like foam upon the wave;
 But naught distinct they see:
 Wide raged the battle on the plain;
 Spears shook, and falchions flash'd amain;
 Fell England's arrow-flight like rain;
 Crests rose, and stoop'd, and rose again,
 Wild and disorderly."

Again:

"But as they left the darkening heath,
 More desperate grew the strife of death.
 The English shafts in volleys hail'd,
 In headlong charge their horse assail'd;
 Front, flank, and rear, the squadrons sweep
 To break the Scottish circle deep,
 That fought around their king.
 But yet, though thick the shafts as snow,
 Though charging knights like whirlwinds go,
 Though bill-men ply the ghastly blow,
 Unbroken was the ring;
 The stubborn spearmen still made good
 Their dark impenetrable wood,

Each stepping where his comrade stood,
 The instant that he fell.
 No thought was there of dastard flight;
 Link'd in the serried phalanx tight,
 Groom fought like noble, squire like knight,
 As fearlessly and well;
 Till utter darkness closed her wing
 O'er their thin host and wounded king,
 Then skilful Surrey's sage commands
 Led back from strife his shatter'd bands;
 And from the charge they drew,
 As mountain-waves, from wasted lands,
 Sweep back to ocean blue."

Three of his long poems, of course, stand preëminent: "The Lay," "Marmion" and "The Lady of the Lake." He maintained that the first was distinguished for style, the second for description, and the last for incident. His readers and admirers may differ from him; but he must be a bold critic who denies him poetic genius—in view, not only, of the popular fervor, which greeted him and the homage that has endured, but in opposition to the best judges of classic English letters. Mr. Shaw in his careful review says of his poems:

"In their subjects, their versification and their treatment, they were a novelty and an innovation, the success of which was as remarkable as their execution was brilliant. The materials were derived from the legends and exploits of mediæval chivalry, and the persons were borrowed partly from history and partly from imagination. Scott showed a power somewhat akin to that displayed by Shakespeare in combining into one harmonious whole actions partly borrowed from true history and partly filled up from fictitious invention; and in clothing the former with the romantic hues of imagination and picturesque fancy he showed his power no less than in giving to the latter the solidity and reality of truth. The theatre of his action was generally placed in that picturesque border region which spoke so powerfully to his heart, with whose romantic legends he was so wonderfully familiar, and which furnished, from the inexhaustible stores of his memory, such a

mass of striking incident and vivid detail. The notes which he appended in illustration of his poems, like those in which he had elucidated the relics of ballad minstrelsy, show how vast was his treasury of antique lore; and these relics of antiquarian erudition are lighted up with a glow of picturesque and poetical imagination which transforms the dry bones of mediæval learning into the splendid and living body of feudal revival."

"The Chase," with which "The Lady of the Lake" opens, is a splendid specimen of Scott's best style, in which the stag, the horses and the dogs are introduced in a most effective manner, and the entire passage illustrates his highest powers at their best. What more graceful than this luxurious bit of wild flower painting:

"Boon nature scattered free and wild,
Each plant or flower, the mountain's child.
Here eglantine embalmed the air,
Hawthorn and hazel mingled there;
The primrose pale and violet flower,
Found in each cliff a narrow bower;
Fox-glove and night-shade, side by side,
Emblems of punishment and pride,
Group'd their dark hues with every stain
The weather beaten crags retain,
With boughs that quaked at every breath,
Grey birch and aspen wept beneath;
Aloft, the ash and warrior oak
Cast anchor in the rifted rock;
And, higher yet, the pine tree hung
His shatter'd trunk, and frequent flung,
Where seem'd the cliffs to meet on high,
His boughs athwart the narrow'd sky.
Highest of all, where white peaks glanced,
Where glist'ning streamers waved and danced,
The wanderer's eye could barely view
The summer heaven's delicious blue;
So wondrous wild, the whole night seem
The scenery of a fairy dream."

Some one has pronounced the finest single line of modern poetry to be this, from T. Buchanan Read's "Closing Scene":

“The thistledown, the only ghost of flowers
Passed noiseless out of sight.”

It is fairly rivaled by the description of Ellen Douglass:

“A foot more light, a step more true,
Ne'er from the heath flower dashed the dew.
* * * * *
E'en the slight harebell raised its head
Elastic from her airy tread.”

I can hardly understand why so comprehensive a work as Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations* should have missed these last two exquisite lines.

If some of the passages I have referred to could be surpassed, Scott reached the climax in the meeting of Fitz James and Rhoderic and the battle with which the poem closes. Think of Sir Adam Fergusson, receiving his copy of “The Lady of the Lake” when posted with his company on a point of ground exposed to the enemy's artillery—his men prostrate, their captain kneeling at their head, reading aloud the description of this battle, and the listening soldiers only interrupting by a joyous huzza when the French shot struck the bank close above them. Well may Hutton ask, “was ever martial poetry put to fitter use and surer test?”

Walter Scott may not have been a poet—to the taste of some of our modern versifiers and their admirers. One of his biographers confesses that he seldom attained the magic use of words as distinguished from the general effect of vigor, purity and concentration of purpose. He excelled in the description of wild and simple scenes and the expression of wild and simple feelings. He never, for example, could have written such lines as these, taken from a prominent religious weekly, credited to a popular modern poet, declared to be “the most genuine and adequate representative in England of a widespread condition”:

“White girl, your flesh is lilies
Under a frozen moon,
So still is
The rapture of your swoon
Of Whiteness, snow or lilies.”

* * * * *

“Pallid out of the darkness, adorably white,
Pale as the spirit of rain, with the night in her hair,
Renée undulates, shadow-like, under the light,
Into the outer air.”

No! Sir Walter could not have written that. He could no more have described “the delicious drowning in a gulf of opium” than Raphael or Murillo could have painted some of the works of the modern impressionist school. He could never have played their tricks with words of Swinburne, Rossetti, Wilde, or even Tennyson. The super-sensuousness of their many feeble imitators is shocked at the elemental ruggedness of Scott. They shiver before the jaws of the Trossachs, and pale at the combat of Flodden; their frightened spirits rush to cover when the heath shakes at the uprising of Rhoderic’s clansmen; and their little souls never thrill with the patriotic inspiration of the opening lines of the sixth canto: “Breathes there a man,” followed by that noble tribute to Scotland: “O, Caledonia, stern and wild,” which McIntosh declared to be the best thing in the poem, and four lines of which are inscribed on one of the poet’s many monuments:

“By Yarrow’s streams still let me stray,
Though none should guide my feeble way;
Still feel the breeze down Ettrick break,
Although it chill my wither’d cheek.”

Mr. Stedman, who is both critic and poet, and altogether the dean of American letters, says: “Action is a substitute for the ideal.” Taine rejoices that “the components of carnal art” never found entrance into the head of this gentlemanly citizen. “Walter Scott pauses on the threshold of the soul, and, in the vestibule of history, selects, in a Renaissance and the Middle Ages, only the fit and agreeable, blots out plain

spoken words, licentious sensuality, bestial ferocity. After all, his characters, to whatever age he transport them, are his neighbors, farmer gentlemen and ladies, by their education and character, and a great distance from the voluptuous fools of the Restoration, or the ferocious brutes and fierce beasts of the middle ages." George Saintsbury, grudging in his praise of him, declares "that on no sound theory of poetical criticism can Scott be ranked as a poet below Byron, who was his imitator in narrative and his inferior in lyric."

The very learned Professor Jebb, in his "Introduction to Homer," declares that if the spirit in which Scott reanimates the age of chivalry is compared with the spirit in which Homer reanimates the age of Achean heroism, a genuine kinship is discerned. He makes many interesting comparisons between the two poets, and declares that Scott's strong genius was, in the largest sense, Homeric, as being in natural sympathy with the heroic. "Nowhere else," he says, "perhaps, in modern literature could any one be found who, in an equal measure with Scott, has united these three conditions of a true spiritual analogy to Homer;—living realization of a past heroic age; a genius in native sympathy with the heroic; and a manner which joins the spontaneous impulse of the balladist to a higher order of art and intellect."

One who has stood by the still beautiful home of his creation at Abbotsford, has seen the sun upon the Weirclaw Hill sink sweet in Ettrick's vale, or listened to the ripple of the Tweed's silver current, or viewed Melrose aright, cannot fail to be impressed with the thought in these lines, written in his later days, that, if, perchance, the modern critic fails to see the merit of Scott as a poet, the fault may be in him just as the great minstrel so touchingly doubted whether the change was in his surroundings or in himself, when he sang:

"The sun upon the Weirclaw Hill,
In Ettrick's vale, is sinking sweet;
The westland wind is hush and still,
The lake lies sleeping at my feet.

Yet not the landscape to mine eye
Bears those bright hues that once it bore;
Though evening, with her richest dye,
Flames o'er the hills of Ettrick's shore.

“With listless look along the plain,
I see Tweed's silver current glide,
And coldly mark the holy fane
Of Melrose rise in ruin'd pride.
The quiet lake, the balmy air,
The hill, the stream, the tower, the tree,—
Are they still such as once they were?
Or is the dreary change in me?

“Alas, the warp'd and broken board,
How can it bear the painter's dye!
The harp of strain'd and tuneless chord,
How to the minstrel's skill reply!
To aching eyes each landscape lowers,
To feverish pulse each gale blows chill;
And Araby's or Eden's bowers
Were barren as this moorland hill.”

LANCASTER, PA.

III.

SHINTO, THE WAY OF THE GODS.

JESSE FREDERICK STEINER.

The four great religious forces now contending for supremacy in Japan are Shintoism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Christianity. It is true that Shinto within recent years has by government decree been denied the right to be called a religion, and Confucianism is hardly anything more than a system of moral teachings without any supernatural claims, but nevertheless they both exert great influence even to-day and are factors to be reckoned with in the Christianization of Japan. When we turn to tables of religious statistics and try to determine the numerical strength of each of these religions, we find nothing but estimates which are of little value. The difficulty is that the Japanese are very eclectic in their religious tendencies and can see no contradiction in being adherents of two different religious systems at the same time. In America we would hardly expect a man to be both a Mormon and a Christian Scientist, or a Buddhist and a Christian. The Japanese, however, are inclined to look upon their different religions not so much as rivals, but rather as supplementing each other. Thus temporal affairs belong to Shinto, spiritual matters belong to Buddhism, while the inculcation of morals is entrusted to Confucianism. A well-known Japanese professor, Kunitake Kume, said: "I turn to the Shinto priest in case of public festivals, while the Buddhist priest is my ministrant for funeral services. I regulate my conduct according to Confucian maxims and Christian morals. I care little for external forms and doubt whether there are any essential differences in the Kami's eyes between any of the religions of the

civilized world.”¹ Baron Suyematsu’s testimony is: “I can say broadly speaking that all Japanese belong to Shintoism and Buddhism at one and the same time.” Still another said: “In one part of my home we have a Buddhist altar, and in another a Shinto. It is the Confucian classics however that are objects of our greatest reverence.”

While it may be more accurate to describe present-day Shinto as a patriotic cult rather than as a religion, yet in the eyes of the majority of the Japanese people, its old gods are living powers whose favor must be secured if the nation is to prosper. Through the clever manipulation of farseeing statesmen, the old religious aspirations of the people have been turned into patriotic channels so that to-day the only great prayer of Shintoists is for national prosperity, and all the momentum of this old religion is used to strengthen the foundations of the Imperial House. Its assertion that the present Emperor of Japan is a direct descendant of the Sun Goddess causes him to receive reverence and homage bordering on the divine, and undoubtedly is of great value in securing obedience to even his most arbitrary commands. A knowledge then of Shinto is very necessary for a right understanding of the Japanese people. A study of its past development and of its chief characteristics will throw much light on the elusive traits of Japanese character. Besides it will help us to see more distinctly the religious foundations upon which Christian workers must build in their effort to lead the nation from the way of the gods to Him who is the way, the truth and the life.

Shintoism may be defined as a primitive nature worship, later modified by Buddhist doctrines and Chinese ancestor worship. Scholars are generally agreed that it had its origin among the primitive Japanese long before there was any contact with Chinese civilization. However in those early times it seems to have had no name and no definite organization. It merely consisted of superstitious rites and ceremonies, and the worship of the marvels of nature. Later, when Chinese civili-

¹ Count Okuma’s *Fifty Years of New Japan*, Vol. II, p. 41.

zation came to Japan, the term Shinto, meaning way of the gods, came into use to distinguish it from Butsido, the way of the Buddhas. Through Chinese influence there was introduced ancestor worship which soon came to occupy an important place in Shinto rites. Contact with the more elaborate Buddhism was the incentive which led to a better organization of Shinto. In order that it might resist its foreign rival, Shinto borrowed many Buddhist ideas and ceremonies and gradually developed a more orderly system.

The chief sources of our knowledge of primitive Shinto are the Kojiki or Records of Ancient Matters, 712 A.D.; the Nihongi or Chronicles of Japan, 720 A.D.; and the Yengishiki or Institutes of the Period Yengi, 923 A.D. These books, which are a mass of inconsistencies and obscurities, contain the Japanese conception of the beginnings of the world, all told in a mythical narrative that makes no small demand on human credulity. In the beginning matter already existed. The Japanese cosmographer did not consider it necessary to explain its origin. Out of this chaotic mass, gods were produced who carried on the work of creation and brought into existence heaven and earth and mankind. About the first six generations of gods we know nothing. They were probably imagined in order to provide a genealogy for the seventh generation with whom the work of creation began. This seventh generation consisted of the male deity, Izanagi, and the female deity, Izanami. The Nihongi gives us the following account of the creation of earth:²

“The Gods of Heaven addressed Izanagi and Izanami saying: ‘There is the country Toyoashihara. Do you proceed and bring it into order.’ They then gave them the jewel spear of Heaven. Hereupon the two Gods stood on the floating bridge of Heaven, and plunging down the spear, sought for land. Then upon stirring the ocean with it, and bringing it up again,

² This and the following quotations from the Nihongi have been taken from Aston’s translation published in *Transactions of Japan Society of London*, 1896, Supplement, Vol. I, p. 14 ff.

the brine which dripped from the spear point coagulated and became an island which was called Onogorojima. The two Gods descended, dwelt in this island and erected there an eight-fathom palace. They also set up the pillar of Heaven. . . .³ Having thus spoken, they prepared to go round the pillar of Heaven, and made a promise saying, 'Do thou, my younger sister, go round from the left, while I will go round from the right.' Having done so, they went around separately and met, when the female Deity spoke first and said: 'How pretty! a lovely youth.' The male Deity then answered and said: 'How pretty! a lovely maiden.' Finally they became husband and wife. Their first child was the leech whom they straightway placed in a reed-boat and sent adrift. Their next was the Island of Ahaji. This also was not included in the number of their children. Wherefore they returned up again to Heaven and fully reported the circumstances. Then the Heavenly Gods divined this by the greater divination. Upon which they instructed them saying, It was by reason of the woman's having spoken first; ye had better return thither again. Thereupon having divined a time, they went down. The two Deities accordingly went again around the pillar, the male Deity from the left⁴ and the female Deity from the right. When they met, the male Deity spoke first and said: 'How pretty! a lovely maiden.' The female Deity next answered and said: 'How pretty! a lovely youth.' Thereafter they dwelt together in the same palace and had children."

These children, as the text goes on to relate, were the eight

³ This passage is omitted because of its indecency. Unfortunately all this old Japanese literature is marred by the presence of similar passages. Chamberlain, in the introduction to his translation of the *Kojiki* (*Transactions of Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. X, Supplement, p. 56), says: "The shocking obscenity of word and act to which the 'Records' bear witness is another ugly feature which must not quite be passed over in silence. The whole range of literature might perhaps be ransacked in vain for a parallel to the naïve filthiness of the passage forming Section IV of the following translation."

⁴ The left was considered superior to the right, an idea probably borrowed from the Chinese.

islands which made up the geography known to the people of that day. Then the narrative gives the names of the different deities to whom they gave birth. Among them were the wind gods, the food gods and the gods of trees, mountains and valleys. Their last child was the god of fire, in giving birth to whom his mother Izanami was so badly burned that she died. After her death she went to dwell in the land of Yomi or darkness. The narrative then continues:

“Thereafter Izanagi went after Izanami and entered the land of Yomi. When he reached her they conversed together, and Izanami said: ‘My lord and husband, why is thy coming so late? I have already eaten of the cooking furnace of Yomi. Nevertheless I am about to lie down to rest. I pray thee, do not thou look on me.’ Izanagi did not give ear to her, but secretly took his many-toothed comb and breaking off its end tooth, made of it a torch and looked at her. Putrefying matter had gushed up and maggots swarmed. This is why people at the present day avoid using a single light at night, and also avoid throwing away a comb at night. Izanagi was greatly shocked and said: ‘Nay! I have come unawares to a hideous and polluted land.’ So he speedily ran away back again. Then Izanami was angry and said: ‘Why didst thou not observe that which I charged thee? Now am I put to shame.’ So she sent the eight Ugly Females of Yomi to pursue and slay him. Izanagi therefore drew his sword and flourishing it behind him, ran away. Then he took his black head-dress and flung it down. It became changed into grapes which the Ugly Females seeing, took and ate. When they had finished eating them, they again pursued Izanagi. Then he flung down his many-toothed comb which forthwith became changed into bamboo shoots. The Ugly Females pulled them up and ate them, and when they had done eating them, again gave chase. Afterwards Izanami came herself and pursued him. By this time Izanagi had reached the even Pass of Yomi.”

On returning from Yomi, Izanagi carefully bathed in order to purify himself from the corruptions of the lower world. In

this process of bathing a number of deities was created. The Sun Goddess came forth from the washing of his left eye, and to her he allotted the Plains of Heaven. The Moon God, who came forth from his right eye, was given charge of the realm of night. A God named Susa no Wo came from his nose, and took as his kingdom the world beneath the earth. Izanagi's work was now finished, and he dwelt in retirement until the day of his death.

The mythical narrative now tells of the visit of Susa no Wo the ruler of the Lower World to Ameterasu, the Sun Goddess in Heaven. The Sun Goddess was in great fear of his coming, and she had good reason to be for this mischievous god could not restrain himself even in the sacred precincts of heaven. He is said to have broken down the divisions between the rice fields belonging to his sister, to have committed nuisances in the hall where she was celebrating a festival, and to have tortured the pie-bald colt of Heaven and to have thrown it into the room where she and her maidens were weaving the garments of the deities. This so angered her that she entered the rock cave of Heaven and left the world in darkness. This produced consternation among the heavenly deities. They groped around in the darkness and devised various plans to entice her forth from her seclusion. But she was obstinate and declined to show her face again to the world. Finally a female deity arrayed herself in a fantastic way, kindled a fire and in its light performed a rather indecent dance before the assembled gods who were so pleased that they laughed until the heavens shook. The curiosity of the Sun Goddess was aroused, and wishing to know why they were all so boisterous, she peeped out of the door of the cave. A god standing near at once seized her and prevented her from going back into hiding.

These stories might be continued at great length, but only one more will be given to show the line of descent of the Emperors of Japan. Ninigi, the grandson of the Sun Goddess, came down to earth and took up his residence in the southern island of Kyushu. He took as his wife Konohana sakuya

hime, which means the lady blooming like the flowers of the trees. To this union was born a son named Hohodemi who having lost a fish hook in the sea, stood on the seashore and lamented bitterly. While standing there, the Old Man of the sea appeared to him and advised him to seek the help of the Sea God who dwelt in a palace in the depths of the sea. Hohodemi did so, with the result that he not only recovered the lost fish hook, but received in marriage the beautiful daughter of the Sea God. For three years he enjoyed his luxurious life in this wonderful palace, but finally becoming homesick, he returned to the upper world. In a short time his wife followed him and shut herself up in a parturition house to give birth to her child. She cautioned her husband not to look upon her, but his curiosity overcame him and he peeped into the hut only to find that his wife had changed into a monster sea dragon. She felt so keenly the disgrace that had come upon her that she abandoned the new born child and returned to her sea palace, barring the entrance so effectually that no mortal can ever look upon her again. This child was Jimmu Tenno, the first human sovereign of Japan, the date of whose accession to the throne is said to be 660 B.C.⁵

These stories give some idea of the mythology of the Japanese. Some trace a strong resemblance between them and the mythology of other peoples. Others see nothing in these tales but records of invasions and conquests, stories which vaguely outline the struggles of a war-like people contending for a land not their own. Illogical and crude though these stories of early beginnings are, yet largely because the divine origin of the Imperial Line is involved in them, very few Japanese have dared to bring them before the bar of historical criticism.

⁵ Since writing was practically unknown in Japan until the fifth century A. D., our knowledge of the first thousand years of the history of Japan must depend on myths and legends handed down orally, and therefore of not great historical value. The legendary stories concerning the reign of Jimmu Tenno have probably a historical basis in the conquest of Central Japan by an invading army from Kyushu, a few centuries before the Christian era.

However in Japan, as in western lands, religion is being compelled to submit itself to the keen analysis of scholarly minds. The progress of western science in Japan is doing its inevitable work. Before its advance, the fantastic mythology of Shinto must retire into the background of obscurity and disregard. The unfortunate thing about it all is that this breaking up of the old traditions means a rich harvest of scepticism and unbelief, and minds more hostile to the acceptance of religion even in its higher and purer forms.

Shinto not only is rich in myths and legends, but also possesses an innumerable host of gods. Few things in Heaven and earth are unrepresented in its pantheon. The most eminent of all these deities is the Sun Goddess, commonly known as *Ameterasu no Okami*, or Heaven Shining Great Deity. She is described as the ruler of heaven, but is not regarded as a supreme deity.

Sun worship was especially natural to the primitive Japanese who were an agricultural people. Their daily food, their very existence depended upon the light and warmth of the sun. Even in this modern day many of the lower class in Japan look up to the sun as to a moral being of great power who rewards the good and punishes the evil. Griffis in his *Religions of Japan* says: "To the common people the sun is actually a god as none can doubt who sees them worshipping it morning and evening. The writer can never forget one of many similar scenes in Tokyo when late one afternoon the sun which had been hidden behind clouds for a fortnight shone out on the muddy streets. In a moment as with the promptness of a military drill scores of people rushed out of their houses and with faces westward, kneeling, squatting began prayer and worship before the great luminary." There is a custom of keeping awake the night of October 5 in order to worship the sun at sunrise the following morning. There are several places in Tokyo where many people assemble early on New Year's morning to worship the rising sun.

Among the thousands of other nature deities might be men-

tioned the following: Susa no Wo, the god of the rain storm, a fierce deity, a lover of destruction who vents his rage by visiting the land with typhoons and floods; Tsukiyomi, the moon god; Amatsu Mikahoshi, the star god; Ame no Minakanushi, the sky god; Ohonamochi, the great earth god. Every mountain, every river has its deity. Even wells have their gods which are widely worshipped. If old wells must be filled up, a bamboo is first inserted so as to appease the spirit residing there. There are many fire gods to give protection against conflagrations so common in Japan where all buildings are of flimsy construction. Inari, the rice god, is often prayed to for agricultural prosperity. The functions of this god have in modern times been much enlarged; wives supplicate him to make their husbands faithful, wrestlers to obtain victory in their contests, and geisha for wealthy lovers. The Inari at Kyoto is the special patron of swordsmiths and prostitutes. He is usually represented as a fox, and many of the country people worship the wild foxes and build shrines in their honor.

Trees of special size and age are often worshipped as deities, a tiny shrine being built at their foot. In Kyoto there are two evergreen trees which are joined together by a branch which has grown from one trunk into that of the other. These trees are visited by wives who wish to live in harmony with their husbands. In some places there exists the custom of intimidation of trees that fail to produce fruit. One man climbs up in the tree, while another holding an axe stands on the ground beside the trunk. The latter asks the tree whether it will bring forth a good crop of fruit the next season, and threatens to cut it down if it fails to do so. Then the man up in the branches answers for the tree promising that it will bear plentifully.⁶

Every household has its housegods of various names whose duty it is to guard the buildings from harm. There is even a god of the privy, which one is to address in prayer when one enters and leaves this place. These unclean places are supposed

⁶ Aston's *Shinto*, pp. 164-65.

to be the favorite resort of evil spirits who will do a person harm if he is not under the protection of the deity who resides there.

To this large nature pantheon must be added an immense number of man deities. One of the most conspicuous of these is the war god, Hachiman, whose shrine is seen almost everywhere. His origin is not clearly known, but he seems to have given in ancient times great assistance in repelling an invasion from Korea. Temmangu, the god of learning, was formerly a man named Sugahara Michizane, a scholar of the ninth century. It would be impossible to enumerate even the most famous Shinto gods who are deified⁷ men. It would include the whole Imperial Line, all the heroes of war, statesmen of note and every one whose merit won for him wide recognition. Even men of only local fame are worshipped in their local shrines so that there is before every man the possibility of becoming a Shinto god after death. The spirits of the soldiers who died in the recent wars are given a dwelling place in certain shrines, and every spring a large festival is held when these spirits are worshipped publicly. On such occasions students of the different schools march to these shrines in a body and bow before the spirits of those who died in battle.

Then there are gods of abstract human qualities such as the Sahe no Kami or phallic deities. These gods have never had any temples or written rituals, and seem, at least in later Shinto, not to have had any official recognition. However from the most primitive times, stone and wooden figures, male and female, were set up opposite each other along the highways to guard against evil spirits, and were the special gods of travellers. As late as 1870, the highway between Utsunomiya and Nikko was adorned at frequent intervals with these im-

⁷ We must bear in mind the fact that this deification does not mean to the Japanese mind an elevation to another kind of being. Men and gods differ in degree and not in kind. Deification, then, is simply an elevation to a higher rank and does not confer the qualities we associate with the term deity.

ages, but were then removed by order of the government. The worship was not necessarily immoral. The phallus was the symbol of physical strength and vigor and was often invoked to give protection and aid to those in need. Nevertheless at the phallic festivals in some districts, all restraint was thrown aside and wild orgies were indulged in. Mr. Aston in his translation of the Nihongi says that he once witnessed a phallic procession in a town near Tokyo, which he describes as a "veritable Bacchic rout." There are still domestic shrines in the lupanars where phallic deities are propitiated by keeping a lamp constantly burning before them. To-day it is only in some of the more remote mountain districts that these images can be seen publicly displayed.⁸

This hasty review of the Shinto gods is very incomplete and fails to give an adequate idea of the extent of the pantheon. Every branch of industry has its god patron, and almost every trivial act of daily life has its deity. Nothing is too insignificant to be deified and worshipped as the occasion demands. This custom has naturally resulted in the creation of an immense number of gods who are referred to in popular phrase as "the eight million gods and goddesses."

The shrines in which these Shinto gods are worshipped are not costly or elaborate as are the Buddhist temples. Stern simplicity and plainness characterize all their buildings. No hall is provided for the joint worship of the believers. Assemblies for worship are very rare. Usually the individual worshipper steps before the shrine, rings the gong to summon the deity, claps his hands, bows his head and prays. If his petition is written as is often the case, he hangs it up on the lattice work, and after ringing the bell to dismiss the god he retires. A large box a couple of feet square stands in front of the door to receive the copper coins that are invariably offered by the suppliant. These acts of worship are not performed at

⁸ Those interested in this subject will find further information in E. Buckley's *Phallicism in Japan*, University of Chicago Press, 1895. It was written as a doctor's thesis, and was based on actual investigation in Japan. Also see Aston's *Shinto*, pp. 186-98.

stated intervals. Shinto knows nothing of a Sabbath set apart for religious exercises. Shintoists are not expected to come to the shrine except when they have a favor to ask of the gods.

Shinto in its early days had no special order of priests. The Mikado was at the same time both high priest and king. Gradually however elaborate rituals and ceremonies were evolved, and this made necessary the organization of a regular priesthood. These priests were divided into three classes, the Nakatomi, who had charge of the ritual; the Imbe, who prepared the offerings; and the Urabe or diviners, whose duty it was to find out the will of the gods. The office of priest was hereditary and in former times was a position of great influence; at present however the priesthood has so deteriorated that it no longer commands the respect of the people.

Offerings to the gods were of the most varied kinds. Since the gods were supposed to possess human tastes and desires, it was believed that anything that would please men would please the deities. The most important offerings were food and drink. At the present time the daily offerings made to the Sun Goddess at the shrines of Ise, consist of 4 cups of sake, 16 bowls of rice and 4 of salt, besides fish, fruit, seaweeds and vegetables. Clothing was also in former times offered to the gods, but gradually it became customary to substitute paper which was less expensive. Also in the smaller shrines especially the gods had to be content with very simple offerings. The people contended that since the god did not really eat the food or wear the clothing, a little rice or a few hemp leaves ought to satisfy him as well as more expensive gifts.

The true Shinto shrine contains no images. Shinto is not an idolatrous religion. Its innumerable gods were very seldom fashioned in the likeness of animals or men. The chief object in the shrine is the mirror which the Sun Goddess gave to men to be her substitute here on earth. The two objects that always attract the attention of the foreign observer are the torii and the gohei. The torii consists of two upright posts upon which a large beam rests. It was originally a perch for

the fowls offered up to the gods not as food but to give warning of daybreak. Later its earlier meaning was lost sight of and it has become merely a gateway standing at the entrance of every shrine. The gohei which means sacred offering has the form of a wand supporting a pendant of paper zigzags. It originally symbolized the cloth presented by the worshipper to the god and now signifies the presence of the god himself. It is to Shinto largely what the crucifix is to Roman Catholicism.

Shinto has always insisted upon absolute cleanliness. For the purification of the spirit the best means is the cleansing of the body. Unlimited bathing is considered highly efficacious. In Japan cleanliness of body is a characteristic of the people. Probably the majority of the people enjoy a hot bath nearly every day. Very doubtless this national custom of bathing and Shinto rites of cleanliness have a close relation to each other. However the religious devotee of the Shinto faith who desires to be purified, does not think of enjoying the worldly luxury of a hot bath. His ablutions must be made in water fresh from the well or river regardless of the season. Most efficacious of all is to stand under a waterfall in midwinter; and the best time is the early morning hours before daylight when the gods themselves are enjoying their bath and welcome to their fellowship the mortals zealous enough to take a morning plunge.

In ancient times a less strenuous method of getting rid of the corruption of sin was sometimes followed. A suit of new clothing made for the purpose was breathed upon three times by the one who wished to be purified and then given to the priests to be thrown into the river and allowed to float away. At present this same object is attained in a less expensive way. Some white paper cut into the shape of a garment is received from the priests at the shrine. Upon this the person writes his name, day of birth and sex, and then rubs it over his whole body. After his impurities have in this manner been transferred to the paper, it is given back to the priest who throws it away in the river or the sea. There was formerly a national purification ceremony in which the Emperor by virtue of being

a direct descendant of the Sun Goddess declared to the people absolution of their sins and impurities. This ceremony was performed twice each year at the end of the 6th and 12th months. In later times there have arisen many perversions of this purification ceremony. Sometimes the priests make up a small package consisting of a fragment of an old shrine and a small piece of gohei, and then sell this to their parishioners as a kind of symbol of purification. We must bear in mind however that in all these rites it was ceremonial cleansing and not purity of heart that was the goal in view.

There is also a demon expelling ceremony called Oniyarahi for the purification of private dwellings. In this ceremony, disease and ill luck are personified and then driven away with some show of violence. Formerly a man would dress up as a devil or would disguise himself as a demon of pestilence and then would be forcibly expelled by the people. At the present time on the last day of the year, the master of the house goes through the different rooms and scatters parched beans in every corner, at the same time crying out, "Oni wa soto; fuku wa uchi," that is "out with the devils and in with the luck." The common people believe in the efficacy of the beans because they hit the devils in the eye and blind them.

There might also be mentioned the tatarigami wo utsushi tatematsuru norito or service for the respectful removal of deities who send a curse. In the course of this ceremony the mischievous deities are presented with various offerings more or less costly, and then are requested to retire to some quiet place in the mountains and enjoy there the offerings rather than to remain about the house and carry on their evil work.⁹

Festivals form the chief part of religious worship in Shinto, but with their revelry, feasting and rejoicing, they do not seem intended to express the higher religious emotions. Once a year the local deities must be taken out for an airing, and in

⁹ Just last year in a suburb of Tokyo, the evil spirit of a haunted bridge was exorcised by Shinto priests with elaborate and costly rites.

this duty all the people participate and make of the occasion a magnificent carnival or picnic. The great feature of these festivals is the procession in which the different deities are carried amid great splendor through the principal streets. To carry the gods in triumphal procession is regarded as a fitting expression of popular devotion. Sometimes this revelry is carried to excess and the festival begun in honor of the gods is ended in debauchery. Visitors to the famous shrines of Ise will find houses of vice within sight of the sacred groves, and the devout pilgrims who fall victims to the wiles of the courtesans are not disqualified for the accomplishment of their pious purpose. By the simple act of bathing the body, all impurities are removed and the sins of the night are forgotten.

In the processions each deity is carried in a sacred palanquin, a shrine on wheels, the whole being magnificently decorated with gilt and lacquer. The deity ordinarily is not exposed to view but is hidden in the seclusion of the shrine, and is often represented merely by some symbol of his presence. The familiar sight of a Shinto procession¹⁰ is one that can never be forgotten. The priests in festal robes followed by crowds of attendants bearing various sacred objects and old relics, the grotesquely masked musicians with their weird music, the sacred cars bearing the special deities who are being honored, each car being followed by attendants carrying the deities, banquet table and rice box, and last of all a wagon with a large platform on which are thirty or forty dancing girls and actors posturing, dancing and singing to the accompaniment of flute and drum. The streets through which the procession passes are crowded with people dressed in their gayest colored clothes for it is a picnic time for all who live in that district. All the approaches to the shrine are decorated with lanterns, flags and evergreen arches. Vendors of toys, cakes and various knickknacks, have booths in every available

¹⁰ These processions are by no means a thing of the past. In "The Far East" of August 30, 1913, can be found a very dramatic description of the Temma festival at Osaka in which all the old rites and ceremonies were carried out on a magnificent scale.

space in the temple yard. Professional actors and dancing girls act out historical dramas on elevated platforms in full view of all the people. Crowds of happy people surge back and forth spending their money freely, all bent on making the most of their holiday. Now and then a solitary person will slip out of the crowd, bow before the shrine and worship the god in whose honor the festival is held. But such acts of worship are not a necessary part of the day's program, and doubtless in the minds of most of the people these festivals awaken no religious sentiments whatsoever.

One of the greatest festivals in Japan is the Gion matsuri in Kyoto, at which the object of worship is a sword forged by a celebrated swordsmith of the past. This sword is supposed to possess the power to cure some kinds of sickness and is held in the most reverential honor.

In one of the suburbs of Tokyo, the eagle has a shrine built in its honor, which has become a place of pilgrimage for wrestlers, dancing girls, courtesans, tradesmen and for all who desire to gain riches. Every November thousands of people attend the eagle festival and purchase harbingers of luck to insure their good fortune the following year. At some shrines on the last evening of the year, the people assemble in order to light their tapers from the lamp kept burning perpetually within the shrine. This lighted taper is then taken home and placed before the household altar as a beacon of domestic prosperity. Pieces of charred wood received from the priests are worn as amulets to ward off pestilence and plague.

Pilgrimages are very popular among the Japanese. Every summer between July and September the roads to popular shrines are crowded with pilgrims with wallet in girdle, and staff in hand. While these pilgrimages are made ostensibly for a religious purpose, yet they are by no means solemn journeys with the idea of penance or austerity uppermost in the mind. They seem more like walking picnic parties slightly colored by piety. Women are allowed to visit the shrines on the plains, and gaily bedecked parties of the fair sex off on a

holiday excursion to a local shrine is one of the picturesque sights of the country districts. But the sacred shrines on the mountain peaks are not for women worshippers. Woman is considered too godless a creature to tread such sacred ground. For her the gorgeous sight of a mountain sunrise is not possible. She must be content with the more prosaic plains where dwell the gods of lesser note.

As the pilgrims march up the steep mountain paths they join in a kind of chant which only by courtesy could be termed music. A common refrain is: "Rokkon Shōjō; Oyama kaisei;" which means: May our six senses be pure and may the weather be fine on the mountain peak. This is a purification prayer joined with a petition for fine weather, this latter seemingly trivial request being indeed of great importance for mountain climbing in the rain does not conduce to piety.

These examples of religious rites mixed with strange superstitions might be multiplied at great length. The higher classes and those who are well educated laugh at the common people who still cherish the old forms and traditions. But since the lower classes, the artisans, traders and farmers, represent by far the majority of the people, we can easily see that these rites still play a great part in molding the life of the nation.

When Buddhism was introduced into Japan in 522 A.D. Shinto as a religion was doomed. The foreign faith with its fine architecture, elaborate ritual and ornate costumes worn by its priests was far more attractive than the simple rites and customs of the Shintoists. Also in its ideals of love and humanity, in its doctrines of the future and in its advocacy of a holy contemplative life, Buddhism struck a new note entirely unknown to the old Shinto cult. At first the two religions were bitter rivals, but gradually the new and more vigorous religion conquered the old by a process of absorption. A religious genius of the eighth century declared that an oracle had revealed to him that the Shinto Sun Goddess was none other than the great Buddhist Vairochana, who was the personifica-

tion of absolute purity and enlightenment. This happy thought was further amplified by recognizing all the chief Shinto gods as incarnations of former Buddhas. This new religion called Ryobu Shinto was essentially Buddhist. It received from Shinto very little more than a number of deities. Buddhist priests took charge of Shinto shrines, beautified them and conducted the services in accordance with Buddhist traditions. The national shrines at Ise were powerful enough to resist the encroachments of Buddhism, and to this day Shinto worship is carried on there in its original simplicity. Of course many local shrines especially in country districts remained untouched by Buddhist influence. But nevertheless as Chinese civilization gained a foothold in Japan, the old traditions were more and more cast aside and Shinto entered into a period of decline.

In the eighteenth century there was a reaction against the high place accorded Chinese learning in Japan, and some scholars who had studied deeply the past history of their nation, began to advocate the banishment of foreign influences and a return to the old Shinto faith. However this agitation for the revival of Pure Shinto was a retrograde movement which was destined to end in failure. Its greatest result was in arousing a sentiment among the people that led to the Restoration of 1868 when the Shogunate was abolished and the Emperor was given his rightful place as the real head of the nation. But this new era which Shinto helped to usher in was destined to bring in new forces against which Shinto was not able to stand. The new learning from the west soon revealed the absurdities upon which the foundations of Shinto really rest. The disestablishment of Shinto soon followed as a matter of course. By government decree Shinto was secularized and placed by itself under the care of a bureau of shrines, while Buddhism and Christianity were looked after by the bureau of religions. The officials of the shrines at Ise have asserted within recent years that Shinto is "merely a mechanism for keeping generations in touch with generations and pre-

serving the continuity of the nation's veneration for its ancestors." It has thus based its final stand not on religion but on national sentiment.

This disestablishment of Shinto could not have been accomplished so easily, if it had possessed the characteristics of a real religion. In our discussion of the myths of Shinto, its gods, its priests, its worship, its ceremonies and festivals, we have said very little about its positive religious teachings. The fact is its theology is so meager that there is very little to say about it. Its whole body of doctrine can be summed up in the phrase, "Fear the gods and obey the Emperor." It does not have a supreme deity. It says nothing about a holy and righteous God who hates evil; or about a loving God who forgives the penitent. It has no positive teachings about the future life. Its underworld has a real existence, but it is simply the abode of the spirits of those who have gone on before. There is nothing to indicate that a man's welfare after death is affected by his conduct in this life. It has no code of morals and makes no pretence of bettering the moral life of its adherents.

It believes in the efficacy of prayer, but its prayers are always for material blessings. Spiritual needs are not considered. Through pilgrimages, offerings and lustrations, efforts are made to please the deities in the hope that some material benefit may be received. Such prayers as "Help us to live a good life," "Lead us not into temptation" or "Thy will be done," are entirely absent from its rituals.

Its chief mission at the present time in the eyes of the government is to strengthen the foundations of the Imperial house. Patriotism and loyalty are its great virtues. It teaches that Japan is the country of the gods and therefore superior to all other countries. Its Emperor is no ordinary mortal but is a descendant of the gods and therefore his right to rule can not be questioned. It takes the religious longings and emotions of the people and turns them into patriotic channels. It teaches men to believe that the highest and noblest life is that which is spent in the service of their country.

While all this is true, yet Shinto still is a real religious force. It is hard to realize the strong hold it has on the lower classes. Tens of thousands of pilgrims journey many weary miles each spring to worship at the shrines of Ise, while vast numbers of others pay their respects to shrines of lesser note. Many a peasant believes that his farm will not bring forth good fruit unless his pilgrimage to Ise has been accomplished. Many a business man attributes his failure to the neglect of this important journey. Many a family still believes that its welfare depends on securing the favor of its household gods.

All this has to be taken into account in our efforts to Christianize the Japanese nation. It is a serious thing to undermine the crude faith of even the humblest peasant, for his mind may not be able to grasp the higher truths that are offered. In order that our efforts to help may lead, not to doubt but to a fuller conception of the truth, great wisdom on our part is required. More is necessary than simply a passionate zeal for the cause of Christ. Patience must possess our hearts, the spirit of intolerance so characteristic of us Christians must be subdued, and through careful study of the religions of the world we must learn to see God's hand in it all striving to lead men out into the light. To God's all seeing eye there must be visible some great purpose in this diversity of faiths, so different in their explanations of the mysteries of life. We ministers of his must try to gain this vision so that we can intelligently present the Christian message to the whole world.

Shinto is not numbered among the great religions of the world. Not many think it worthy of serious study. But those who are interested in the Christianization of Japan must realize that it is a force that has got to be reckoned with. Its day of usefulness may be gone but its impress is stamped deeply on the character of the people. The classic literature of the nation is filled with allusions to Shinto rites and beliefs, and the folk lore and fairy tales so dear to every Japanese child, have to do with the deeds of the gods of Old Japan. For years, yes for generations many Japanese will look at

Christianity through Shinto eyes, and even those who accept Christ will find it hard to adjust their new truths to the thought world inherited from their fathers. All this impresses us with the fact that to win Japan for Christ is a serious work calling for our best efforts, and demanding a deep faith in God's purpose to lead all his people into one fold.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

ORIGINAL SOURCES.

- Kojiki (translated by B. H. Chamberlain in *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. X, Supplement, 1883).
 Nihongi (translated by W. G. Aston in *Transactions of the Japan Society of London*, Supplement, 2 vol., 1896).
 Yengishiki (translated by E. Satow and K. Florenz in *Transactions of Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. VII (1879); Vol. IX (1881), and Vol. XXVI (1899).
 Eighteenth century writings of Mabuchi, Motöri and Hirata. (Untranslated, but a good account of their works can be found in E. Satow's *Revival of Pure Shinto in Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. III, 1875.)

MODERN EXPOSITIONS.

- Aston, W. G., "Shinto," London, 1905.
 Knox, W. K., "The Development of Religion in Japan," New York, 1907.
 Griffis, W. E., "The Religions of Japan," New York, 1895.
 Moore, G. F., "History of Religions," New York, 1913.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
 CHICAGO, ILL.

IV.

EVANGELISM IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

A. O. REITER.

The word "evangelist" as it comes to us direct from the Greek, signifies a teller of good news. The word evangelism, an English derivative, would therefore mean the habit, custom or practice of telling the good news. But the word evangelist in New Testament Greek has a specific meaning. The good news is the news that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. And that the Christ has come and dwelt among men in the person of Jesus who was born of Mary, lived and taught and worked wonders in Judea and Galilee, died on the cross on Calvary, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and in these last days has poured out of his spirit upon men to the end that being empowered by Him they may call into the church all that are being saved. And this one spirit has conferred different gifts on different men. In Ephesians 4: 11, we read: "He gave some to be apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." Evidently the word evangelist, to Paul did not signify every disciple or preacher nor would the term evangelism be applied to every activity of the followers of Christ. But if we may not use the term evangelist of every disciple or preacher in the first century, we shall certainly go equally wide of the mark if we assume that Paul had in mind any hard and fast classification of Christian preachers in the church of his day. In I. Cor. 12: 28, he speaks of apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts of healing, helps, governments and divers kinds of tongues; and does not mention evangelists. A like omission must be noted in Rom. 12: 8, where a similar catalogue is

given. Paul is not dealing with orders, or offices within the church, nor is he aiming to give a complete list of all the Christian charisma. His purpose is rather to illustrate his meaning, and to give a general classification along the lines of function and message. In II. Tim. 4: 5, after charging him to "preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching" Paul also enjoins Timothy to "do the work of an evangelist." In this contrast, we have the key to the particular shade of meaning the word evangelist had in the mind of Paul. The apostles were the followers of Jesus who, giving up all, went forth in obedience to the spirit to preach. Their message was a twofold message. Like the prophets of old they were to hold before the people high ideals of righteousness. Without fear or favor they were to make known the demands of God. It was theirs to reprove, rebuke and call to repentance. This was the apostle or preacher in his prophetic function. But these same apostles or others better fitted by the gift of the spirit were to tell to the faint-hearted and the fallen, the sin-cursed and the helpless, the good news of God's infinite love, revealed in the word of grace made flesh, that man, however weak and helpless in himself, might hope with God's renewing power to attain even the high standards demanded by the prophet. And this was the work or function of the evangelist. The same man might be both prophet and evangelist, if, of the spirit of Christ, he had received the double gift. And that same man might also be pastor and teacher, theologian, and poet, and helper of all. There was nothing in the constitution or practice of the early church to prevent a man's being all these. The only limit to the Christian's activities were those imposed by his natural fitness or unfitness for the work, as these were revealed in the power of the spirit. The evangelist differed from the prophet only in that he emphasized more than the prophet the gracious, loving character of God's approach to sinful man.

But one other shade of meaning the word evangelist very

early came to have, which is indicated when we contrast it with the words pastor and teacher. The pastor, as a shepherd, nurtured, fed and cared for those who were already of the Christian fold. The teacher gave specific instruction to those who were eager to learn the way of life. The evangelist had a message of hope and assurance for the stranger, the outcast and the prodigal. This meaning still inheres in the word and is legitimate.

Thus a study of the New Testament use of the word evangelist reveals to us no *jure divino* theory of ecclesiastical order, but it does vindicate for us a word and practice which many of us in the Reformed Church have far too often seemed to fear. As ministers of the word, apostles sent forth in the name of Christ, it is our duty to be not only prophets of righteousness, pastors feeding our flocks, and teachers enlightening our people, but also evangelists speaking in words of love and grace to the discouraged and the heartbroken and to all who will hear us no matter how far from the kingdom of God they may seem to be. Evangelism is the telling of the good-news to those who need that message, as prophetism is the unconditional condemnation of sin and the categorical imperative of duty to those who need that message, and it is largely to evangelism that we as ministers of the gospel—the good-news—of Christ are called. We have no right to allow a certain set of men, who in spirit and in the substance of their message are far more nearly in harmony with John the Baptist, the last of the prophets, than with Jesus the gracious Saviour of mankind, to usurp to themselves the good old name of evangelist and to put upon us the title of mere preacher. We are or ought to be every one of us evangelists, and that is one of our highest and best titles.

Historically the Reformed Church has always been evangelical. The word gospel, of Anglo-Saxon origin, means exactly the same as the Greek evangel—the good message. And as a church we have always insisted that the preaching of the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Less, rather than more than other branches of protestantism, have we

held up the terrors of the law, the wrath of an angry God, and the demands of righteousness as incentives to a decision for Christ and His cause. More, rather than less than others, have we preached the love of God revealed in Christ, the good-news that God forgives sins, and waits to bless those who trust Him as the chief reasons for man's giving himself a living sacrifice of thankfulness to God. To call evangelical a sermon like that celebrated one of Jonathan Edwards entitled "Sinners in the hands of an angry God" and to deny that title to a sermon like that of the late Dr. Nevin on the text "I am come that they might have life and have it more abundantly," is to make a complete reversal in the meaning of an ancient word. When we apply the term evangelism to a concerted and commercialized propaganda, characterized by vulgarity, vituperative tirade and abuse; and marked by physical and emotional excess; while denying the term evangelism to the loving, sympathetic telling of the story of the passion and death and triumph of our Lord in holy week, we sin against every canon of language, ancient, mediæval and modern.

The real evangelists of the Christian world are those humble, pious followers of the Master, pastors or people, who having known the joys of sins forgiven, and tasted the sweetness of fellowship with Christ, rejoice to tell in word or deed the old, old story, the glad new story of a loving father revealed in the son, and forever present in the Holy Spirit, within the contrite heart. Of such evangelists the Reformed Church has always had many and has many to-day. And in the real evangelism of the world the Reformed Church has born a noble and a worthy part.

But when we come to apply the other test of evangelism, which comes not from the root meaning of the word but from an acquired meaning very early added to it, namely, that of telling the good news not only to those of the household of faith but also to the stranger, the outcast and the prodigal, then perhaps we shall have to confess that we of the Reformed Church have not measured up to our full duty. As a church

we have cared for our own, we have provided pastors and teachers for the little ones God has given us, we have followed the erring and the straying of our own households and sought to win them back to Christ. In our catechetical system we have a method of evangelism for which we have no cause to apologize. It has stood the test of time and to-day we are bringing into the church and into fellowship with Christ a very much larger percentage of the children of our own households than do those churches that depend on revivals as a means of evangelizing. As a Christian discipline, formation is better than reformation. Christian nurture is the normal and natural means of bringing up those whom parents have dedicated to Christ in baptism. A psychic earthquake more properly described as transversion than as conversion is abnormal and becomes a necessity only when Christian nurture has been neglected or has failed. But around us in the world there are thousands in whom Christian nurture has failed or has been neglected. They are often of other races, other faiths than our own. For many of them it seems, "no man careth." Have we done our full duty, are we doing our full duty toward these? And if not what change in custom or method or practice or belief must we make that we may reach them? We are not now raising the question of foreign missions, nor even of home missions, but rather that of the inner mission that belongs to every congregation to evangelize those that live in the streets and lanes of our own cities, or lie by the highways and hedges within our own purlieus.

In answer to the first of these questions we may say, that, frankly confessing that we have not done our full duty, and that we are not doing our full duty, we have nevertheless done much more than we are generally credited with doing, and that it has been quite as effectively done as when done by other religious bodies and by other methods. Proportional to our numbers we have reached and *held* for Christ and his church fully as large a percentage of the strangers and outcasts living within our parishes as has any other denomination. That our

statistics do not show this fact is due to our transferring constantly to other denominations so many of our people, and this in turn comes from the very breadth and catholicity of our teaching of which we are justly proud. We must suffer "the defects of our qualities." And we have suffered in our statistical reports, but the church at large has not suffered and the cause of Christ has not suffered. On the contrary our evangelism has been blessed of God and the whole of Christendom has felt the beneficent effect of it.

In answer to the other question, what change in custom, method, practice or belief must we make in order that we may reach more fully and more effectively those who are unchurched and without Christ, let me first quote a statement made publicly by Fred B. Smith, the chairman of a conference on evangelism held under the auspices of the Federation of Churches. "We (of the revivalistic churches) have much more to learn about evangelism from you (the representatives of the Reformed and Lutheran churches) than you have to learn from us." Certainly if we are to make any changes it will not be in the direction of a spasmodic and violent revivalism. We shall not forbid others to use such methods. For even the wrath of men may be made to praise him. But we should ill fulfill our part in the world's work as witnesses for Christ in a true evangelism by conforming to a method that already has an abundance of advocates. Probably the greatest difficulty in the way of a true evangelizing of the average man outside the pale of Christianity in our western cities to-day is his virtual identification of religion with revivalism. And if he has ever come under the spell of a Sam Jones, a Torrey, a Williams or a Billy Sunday and been "converted" and has not been subsequently nurtured and cared for by some pastor or teacher, his case is well-nigh hopeless. An honest and fearless prophetism, a sane and rational evangelism millions of unchurched and Christless people in our country need. But a mechanical and commercialized emotionalism masquerading as both prophetism and evangelism has so usurped the

attention of the people and crystallized their ideas of religion, that the prophet and the evangelist have great difficulty in getting a hearing.

But when we say that violence or revivalism is not the true and natural method of a genuine evangelism, we must not forget that the Kingdom of God may suffer from violent causes other than those which grow out of the emotions. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we had a "revival of learning." The Christian world produced great "experts" of erudition, and the result of the overstressing of the intellectual side of religion was the dead and deadening rationalism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England and Germany. And again back nearly a thousand years in the history of Christianity the whole of Christendom was stirred by a voluntaristic revivalism which had as its object the rescue of the tomb of Christ from the hand of the Saracen. Perhaps, history never repeats itself, but there is often a strong similarity in the cycles of evolution. The movements, campaigns, organizations and schemes innumerable which so strongly characterize the Christianity of the twentieth century certainly bear a strong resemblance to the crusades of a millennium ago. Certainly it is true that "from the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force"; and it matters not whether this violence come from the overstressing of the emotions, the intellect or the will. The son of man, who comes eating and drinking, living a normal life, using all his powers of head and heart, all that "wisdom which is justified of her children" though it lead to the cross, in a sane and genuine evangelism, in the twentieth century as well as the first must deal with people who are like children playing in the markets, and demanding ever some new game to awaken their jaded interest.

Our critics say of us that we are too coldly intellectual, that we preach a religion of the head and not of the heart. And more recently we are told that we are too theoretical and not sufficiently practical, and that it behooves us to "get on to the

job" and taking a leaf from the book of the big corporations of the world "organize for big things." Honest criticism we should welcome, and humbly ask ourselves if it be true. Certainly we are not beyond making mistakes, and we may be erring in stressing too strongly what we are pleased to call "educational religion." But shall we improve our evangelism if we exchange educational religion for either the emotionalistic revivalism or the voluntaristic revivalism that to-day hem us in on either side?

"Not by might and not by power, but by my spirit saith the Lord" is as true in the things of the spirit to-day as it was in the days of the Hebrew prophet. The machine may be admirable but the creaking of the wheels is likely to scare the man who is to be caught and transformed by it. A system that gives a certain church a certain district, and a certain church officer a certain street to be evangelized, and a certain time within which a certain number are to be reached and won for Christ, may be very admirable in the eyes of the man whose shibboleths are standardization and organization and efficiency. But unfortunately for the system, neither the spirit of God nor the spirit of man work that way. The spirit of God is as the wind that bloweth where it listeth and the spirit of man discerns intuitively the spiritual things of a man. The man who is approached by a certain man on a certain day because the standardized organization makes it that man's duty to tell the good news to that man on that day, and not because of a genuine and personal love in his heart is very apt to give back a cold and icy stare instead of a glad response to the well meant invitation. Coöperation between pastor and people is both desirable and necessary, but the mechanism of a concerted campaign is liable to prove disastrous. Personality, spontaneity, freedom from conventionality and pure love are of the very essence of genuine and successful evangelism and these are all liable to be destroyed through over-organization or systemization of an evangelistic campaign.

But we are told we must do something to check the fearful

losses which the church now sustains annually through the erasure of names. This evil seems to have reached alarming proportions, not only in the Reformed Church but in all churches including the Roman Catholic. Whether the names are actually erased or not is not of great importance, the fact remains that many who have followed Christ for a longer or shorter period, no longer are to be found among his disciples. We are told, to check this evil, we must have a new evangelism, an evangelism that is organized, definite, business-like. A card index, with an up to date "follow up" system is recommended and urged upon us. Social service with a definite social activity for every member is also recommended. What a pity it is that none of these things had as yet been discovered on that day when Jesus and the twelve, returning from the feeding of the five thousand, found that the multitude, caring only for the "meat that perisheth," had forsaken him and walked no more with him. Perhaps then He might have been spared that sad almost despairing question: "Will ye too go away?" Perhaps it is the fault of pastors and their consistory who neglect to shape their evangelism to the demands and customs of our age, that so many care so little about the word of God, the bread of the soul. Perhaps it was the fault of Jesus and his consistory that so many turned back, when his kingdom proved not to be of the kind they wanted. But far more probable is it that in the twentieth century as well as the first, the faithful servant must continue to sow the seed, though some of it fall by the wayside, and some on stony ground, and some among thorns, where though it give promise of results it yields no harvest. He must be satisfied, that some falls on good soil, and, growing until the harvest, produces bountifully. In proportion to the number of followers, there were more "erasures" in that third year of the Master's ministry, than in any year since. But the Master did not consider that a reason for changing his rejection of the temptations in the wilderness. He was come not to render social service by increasing the food supply, nor to interest the people through providing a

spectacle, nor to control the kingdoms of this world as a political power even in the interest of righteousness. He had come that men might have life. And his message was the evangel, the gospel, the good-news of the kingdom, the rule of God in human hearts, the peace of God for all who would come to Him. His fealty to his purpose led to the practical disruption of his church, and Him to Gethsemane, and the Cross. A like evangelism in the twentieth century may have little more semblance of what the world calls success.

But we have not done our full duty and we are not doing our full duty in evangelizing the sinning, suffering, sorrowing sons of men who are living all about us, and awaiting, though knowing it not, the good news we have to tell. What change do we need to make in custom, practice or belief that we may measure up to our responsibility. First of all must we not realize what was meant by the protestant doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers? Our people must know that not only the pastor but that they too are priests of God to bring others to Him. The preacher in the Reformed Church may well represent the apostle of Christ, he may likewise be the prophet to the congregation. But every man, woman and child who has tasted and seen that the Lord is good, must become witnesses, tellers of the good news in word and deed to all around them. And actions speak far louder than words. If we could have every member of the Reformed Church present at every public service in our churches for one year, thereby showing to the world that to us fellowship with God is of more importance than money getting and the source of greater joy than automobile riding or trolley riding or baseball or feasting, even though we said not one word to the foreigners living about us, they would be evangelized and would be found pressing into our churches to ask a share in that which we found so precious. And if in addition to this zeal in worship we added a genuine, kindly and loving interest in times of sorrow and trial, and an occasional spontaneous testimony to the help and blessing we receive from communion and fellowship

with God, we should be compelled to enlarge our churches in the near future. Our people do not recognize this responsibility, nor are they entirely to blame, we of the ministry have been largely at fault. We have far too often and too continuously treated them as though they were the objects of our evangelizing energy (using that word in the Pauline sense) when instead we should have been prophets (likewise in the Pauline sense) to announce to them the unconditional demands of God. Under social conditions altogether different from those now existing, there grew up in this country a custom of purely social visiting which to this day demands that a preacher waste a large part of his energy in coddling saints, instead of evangelizing sinners. The people expect it, and we are weak enough to yield to the demand. The people should be made to know that they are not merely "the saved monuments of divine grace," but likewise centres and sources of divine energy: that having named the name of Christ and enlisted in his service by uniting with the church, it is their unconditional duty first to attend public worship that they may receive the benefit of the minister's labors as *pastor*, that is, provider of food, and *teacher*, that is, instructor in the way, and second to become *evangelists*, that is, tellers of the good news in word and especially in deed, to all with whom they come into contact. And that the people may come to know and realize these things we preachers need to reassert far more strongly than we have been doing our apostolic and prophetic function. The minister is but one of the servants in the household of the great King. He is the pastor, the steward, the preparer of the food for the feast. It is the duty of the other servants of the same household to go out into the streets and lanes of the city, the highways and hedges of the surrounding country to invite or constrain men to come to the feast of the bread of God, the pastor has planned and prepared. If the pastor leaves his rightful task to do this work or worse still, coax rebellious fellow servants to the table, the meal itself will be overdone or underdone or not done at all. We must refuse

to become servers of tables, messenger boys to toady to the disgruntled, mechanics to construct, furnish the motive power and run ecclesiastical machinery, or even promoters of movements and campaigns after the pattern of big business for the glory of God. We have higher and holier and more important duties to perform than these. And highest of all is the duty of reawakening the consciousness of the reality and presence of a living, personal God, who both animates human hearts, and demands of those he has touched, service in his name. If we of the Reformed Church are ever to attain to the measure of our duty in the service called evangelism, we of the ministry will have to apply ourselves a great deal more closely than we have been doing to the one all embracing duty which is the sole enduring basis for service. The great crying need of our day is God, a conscious reality in the lives of the people. To far too many, God is simply a name, and the church simply a contrivance for social uplift, and both necessities for civilization. We must make God the most real person in all the world, the church the one institution that teaches men to walk humbly with God, taking Jesus Christ as their pattern and the Holy Spirit as their guide and sustainer. If we do this, evangelism together with every other form of real service will follow as a fruit as naturally and as certainly and with as little machinery as grapes grow on the vine.

Since the earliest times in the Christian Church, Whitsunday and Easter have been the great days of ingathering for the church, and the preceding seasons of Epiphany and Lent, times of special evangelistic effort. Among Protestants, preserving a churchly order (the Reformed, Lutheran and Episcopal Churches), this practice has been consistently continued and God has blessed this evangelistic zeal with abundant fruitage. What we need is this same zeal, this same devotion and consecration, throughout all the year. It has been well said that "nothing great was ever done without enthusiasm." And just as truthfully we might say that nothing lasting was ever done through an artificially stimulated enthu-

siasm. Not stimulants, emotional, intellectual or voluntaristic, but God in us, as the power to will and to do His good pleasure, alone can make us faithful and fruitful evangelists. God has blessed our evangelism in the past, He continues to bless it with a fruitage commensurate to our zeal. The faithful pastor and the faithful lay members of the church who have experienced the life of God in their own soul by the power of the Holy Spirit continue to go in and out of the streets and lanes, the highways and hedges of the world, striving to communicate by the living touch of character and the power of the word and spirit, that same spirit and that same life to God's other and hitherto less fortunate children. As individuals we touch individuals, as persons we touch persons, as the sons of God we go to God's others son's to tell them the father still loves them, and assure them of His welcome. And as the evidence and proof the sign and seal of that love and assurance we tell them the good news, the gospel, the evangel of Christ the Son of God. The Reformed Church will become more effective and more fruitful in this glorious work when we as ministers yield ourselves unreservedly to the great work of God, as apostles of Christ to train the great priesthood of believers to know that our mission is not to them alone, but to make of them missionaries and evangelists to the world.

POTTSVILLE, PA.

V.

COLONIAL CORRESPONDENCE: EDITED AND ANNOTATED.

JOHN BAER STOUTD.

The following letter, written by Simon Dreisbach, Jr., an elder in Zion's Reformed Congregation, Stone Church, of Allen township, Northampton county, Pa., to Rev. Johannes Helfrich, recently came into my possession. It gives us a pen-picture of the religious conditions of the western part of what is now Northampton county during the colonial period and reveals a denominational consciousness to which the Reformed Church owes her preservation. It further enables one, together with the minutes of Cœtus, to trace the development of the Stone Church, which, together with the First Reformed Church of Easton, are the oldest Reformed congregations in the county.

The first mention of this congregation is found in the diary of Rev. Michael Schlatter, who visited it June 25 and 26, 1747.

"From Wednesday to Saturday the 24th, 25th and 26th, I visited the congregations in Manatawny (Maxatawny), Magunchy (Ziegel), Egypt and near the Lehigh, a circuit of forty-five miles and came near to Bethlehem, a location of the Moravians and here in the providence of God, I met with Jacob Lischy, who was at that time attached to that sect. This man, although he had never before seen me, resolved to accompany me a distance of ten miles to Nazareth. When we got into conversation, this man very magnanimously manifested a hearty penitence and sorrow that he had suffered himself, with many other erring souls, to be bewitched by the crafty Brethren and to become entangled in the net of their soul destroying teachings and customs. This open-hearted acknowledgment

gave occasion to an extended and earnest conversation, in which I was fully persuaded of the honesty and sincerity of his intentions and of his firmly formed determination completely to separate himself from the Brethren and gladly return again into the bosom of the true Reformed Church. . . .

“In this region there are four or five small congregations, namely: Saccony, Forks of Delaware, Springfield and Lehigh, which would be able to contribute about thirty-three pounds, or 233 Dutch guilders for the support of a minister. Here, too there is a great need of an able minister, since Bethlehem, the sear of the Moravians is near to it.” (Schlatter’s *Life and Travels*, by Harbaugh, pp. 160–162.)

The Indian uprisings of 1755–58 threw the whole region into a state of confusion, arrested its development and retarded the progress of religion and education. Three small log churches were erected, at Jost Dreisbach’s Mill, the oldest, at Indian Land, and in Moore township.

On the 25th of February, 1771, a large number of citizens from Allen, Moore and Lehigh townships met and decided to erect a union church of stone, 36 × 46 feet, at Indian Creek, along the King’s Highway at the township line between Allen and Lehigh townships. Adam Dreisbach, Caspar Erb and Simon Dreisbach (Reformed), and Balentin Waldman, George Edelman and George Michael (Lutheran), were appointed a building committee. The church was dedicated, November 15, 1772, at which time Rev. John Henry Helfrich (Reformed) and Rev. Frederick (Lutheran) officiated. Rev. Helfrich one month later (December 15, 1772) administered the holy communion to the Reformed Congregation.

The sermons of Rev. Helfrich caused an awakening among the members, and kindled them with the hope, that their wishes might be realized in the establishment of a strong congregation in a more permanent building. This led their elder Simon Dreisbach, Jr., to address this letter to Rev. Helfrich.

LETTER OF SIMON DREISBACH, MEMBER OF THE INDIAN
CREEK CHURCH, ALLEN TOWNSHIP, NORTHAMPTON
COUNTY, TO THE REV. JOHN HENRY HELFFRICH,
JANUARY, 1773.

“REV. MR. HELFFRICH:¹

“First of all, my friendly greeting to you. I hope that your health is still good.

“After wishing you every good. I cannot forbear troubling you with these few lines and at the same time reminding you not to become remiss in the good beginning that was made to win souls. I am very desirous to know how soon you will come to us again and what other good results you have accomplished in our behalf, namely how we are to be supplied until the next meeting of Cœtus, whether any of the other ministers will visit us, and whether you have written to Mr. Fawer² (Faber), Mr. Blumer³ and Mr. Steiner⁴ and whether they have come to

¹ Rev. John Henry Helfrich was born at Morbach in the Palatinate, October 22, 1739. He studied at Heidelberg and was ordained in 1761. He and his half brother, Albert Helpenstein, were sent by the authorities in Holland to Pennsylvania in 1771. In 1772, he was stationed in Maxatawny, where he continued until the time of his death, December 5, 1810. He served as many as seven congregations at one time. It is recorded of him that “He was a fine scholar and an able preacher.”

² Rev. John Theobald Faber was born in Palatinate, south of Bingen, February 13, 1739. He studied at Heidelberg, where he was ordained in 1763. He was sent by the Classis of Amsterdam to Pennsylvania in 1766 and immediately became the pastor of Goshenhoppen charge. With the exception of a short pastorate in Lancaster and Indian Field, he spent all his years in this charge and here he died, November 2, 1788.

³ Rev. Abraham Blumer, son of Rev. John Jacob Blumer, minister at Belswander and Grabs, was born at Grabs, Switzerland, December 14, 1736 O. S. He matriculated at the University of Basel, August 1, 1754, and was ordained to the holy ministry in 1756 and the following year was appointed chaplain of a Swiss regiment in the service of the king of Sardinia, in which capacity he continued for a period of nine years. He was sent to Pennsylvania by the authorities in Holland and landed at New York in the latter part of January, 1771. On February 17 of the same year, he took charge of the congregations at Egypt, Unionville, Jordan and Allentown. In addition to these he frequently supplied neighboring

an agreement among themselves, which we hope has taken place. We shall be much delighted to hear that they will alternately supply us, until we shall secure a minister. For the Gospel has now taken root in this region through the sermon which you preached if you will only not wait too long before you come again, that the fire may not die out again or that we may not be forgotten entirely as it has happened before. For if we should be neglected our enemy, a hireling, would rejoice exceedingly over it. He is always active to create confusion and to prevent any other minister from coming into this region, especially none of you (from the Cœtus). Wherefore I shall give you a somewhat circumstantial report, yet as brief as I can do it.

“As I have been for a long time an onlooker on church affairs in this region, I cannot forebear mentioning some of the things in the hope that you will patiently hear me.

“About 17 years ago (1756), when I first came to live here, the church attendance, or divine services were very irregular, for hardly half of the time did the minister come when the services had been announced and the people had assembled, hence most of the time the people had to go home without a sermon, at which the people were much annoyed. At that time the people of this region knew nothing of the Cœtus Ministers. Then it was decided to appeal to the Cœtus for a minister, that, if one could be secured, and this evil (of the irregular services) could be done away with, the effort would not be in vain. This was done about 14 years ago (1759),

congregations. He was chaplain of the First Battalion of Northampton County, commanded by Col. Stephen Balliet in 1781. He resigned his charge in 1801 on account of old age and died, April 23, 1822. His remains were buried in the Jordan Reformed Cemetery.

⁴ Rev. Conrad Steiner, Jr., came with his father, Rev. Conrad Steiner, Sr., to Pennsylvania in 1749, whither he was sent as a missionary, by the Deputies of Holland. Prior to 1771, Conrad, the younger, had been serving as school master and catechist. In 1771, he was suggested by Rev. Leydich as his successor in the congregation of Upper Milford and Salisbury. He was ordained in 1772 and died in 1782.

when my father (Simon Dreisbach⁵) and Johannes Ditter⁶ the elders, went with much trouble to Easton and Plainfield and Greenwich (Grunitsch), in order to induce said congregations to unite with us in asking for a minister. This was done and they went unitedly before the Cœtus.⁷ A minister was promised to us, as soon as one should come in (from Holland). Meanwhile Rev. Mr. Leydich⁸ and Rev. Michael⁹

⁵ Simon Dreisbach, Sr. (August 7, 1698–March 31, 1785) and family, natives of Oberndorf, Wittgenstein, Germany; qualified at Philadelphia, September 20, 1743. They settled in Northampton county, near Kreidersville. Two of his sons, Simon, Jr., and Jost, became prominent. A daughter, Catherine (1754–1825), was married to Henry Bowman; their son, John Dieter Bowman, was the grandfather of Bishop Thomas Bowman. His remains and those of many of his descendants lie buried at the Kreidersville (Stone) church.

⁶ John Deter, Sr., of Morestown (Moore Township), Northampton, in his will, dated May 12, 1772, leaves his property to his wife and nine children. His son John is named as executor and is witnessed by his wife, Elizabeth, John Egodius Hecker, Adam Marsch and Christian Lauffer.

⁷ A congregation at Easton, a newly settled village, about sixty miles from Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, has sent in a request for a suitable pastor and preacher. We have promised to make a call, with fifty pounds for his yearly support. Hence we herewith earnestly once more request the continuance of the paternal care of the Rev. Synods and Classis, so as to provide these shepherdless sheep as soon as possible with a godly minister.—*Minutes of Cœtus*, Germantown, October 21–22, 1760.

⁸ Rev. John Philip Leydich was born at Gerkhauser in Westphalia, April 28, 1715; landed at Philadelphia, September 15, 1748, being sent by the Synod of South Holland. He was installed as pastor of the congregation of Falkner Swamp and Providence and continued to serve them until the time of his death, January 4, 1784. He made frequent and extended journeys among the shepherdless congregations. He revived the congregation at Skippach, supplied the congregations of Upper Milford and Saltzburg in Lehigh county, crossed the Schuylkill River and preached to the Germans at Vincent and Coventry in Chester county.

⁹ Rev. Philip Jacob Michael was born 1716 in the Fatherland. He was a weaver by trade and began preaching without ordination in 1750. It is recorded of him "that the people heard him gladly" and that in 1764 he supplied "with the greatest zeal twelve congregations" in and about Maxatawny township. On May 17, 1777, he was appointed chaplain of the 1st Battalion of the Militia of Berks county. In 1780 he again resumed the duties of a pastor in Longswamp congregation. He died in the spring of 1786.

were to supply us until a minister¹⁰ should come in. Each of these congregations gave 12 pounds to the said ministers to come to us on a week-day, every three weeks for one year, which was done and our congregation got its share, until several ministers came in (Stapel 1761 and Weyberg 1762). Meanwhile a congregation was gathered on the Dryland and when Mr. Weinberg¹¹ (Weyberg) preached at Easton, Green-

¹⁰ “Simon Dreisbach, a delegated elder from the congregation in Easton, submitted a petition of said congregation concerning a minister. (The petition is annexed to the Minutes, under Number 1.) The Cœtus was pleased to return a written answer to him, in which the congregation was notified that this matter had not only been laid before the proper authorities, but that also the Rev. Deputies of the Synods of South and North Holland had considered the matter and had called Do. Weyberg for them. Until the arrival of the latter, they shall be served occasionally by the brethren of the Cœtus.”—*M. of C.*, June 30, 1762.

¹¹ Casper Diedrich Weyberg was born at Westofen, in the county of Mark, in Westphalia, Germany. He attended the Latin school at Free-monia-Dortmand and the university at Duisburg. He was examined and commissioned to go to Pennsylvania, September 8-9, 1761. After some delay he sailed and reached Easton, March 3, 1763. He is described as “a tall, slim man, with a powerful voice.” On October 8, 1763, he accepted a call to Philadelphia. In a letter to the congregation at Easton, dated December 14, 1763, he says:

“As regards my congregations, they were well satisfied with me, nor was the divine blessing lacking in my work among you, since many were set right who had gone astray, as I am also convinced that many are walking on the way of the converted to God. Nevertheless my body could not stand riding about and I was therefore compelled to make the resolution to accept one congregation which alone would be able to support me. This desire has been fulfilled by the Philadelphia congregation.”

Weyberg is said to have served as chaplain in the Revolution, and while the British were occupying Philadelphia, the Hessian soldiers thronged to hear him preach. He seized the opportunity and boldly asserted the American Cause, that many of them deserted. Weyberg was arrested by the English authorities and imprisoned. The Rev. Berg in his *Christian Landmarks*, pages 16-17, writes: “I have been assured by aged members of the church, that it used to be confidently affirmed that the Hessians would, in all probability, to a man have left the British service, if the old Father had not been silenced.” He died, August 21, 1790, and was buried in the Reformed Cemetery, now Franklin Square, Philadelphia.

A delegated elder of a congregation on the Lechaw (Lehigh) requested that Cœtus would persuade Do. Weyberg also to supply their church. Whereupon Do. Weyberg declared that he had already three churches, and

wich and Plainfield, he came several times to us. Afterwards they received the Dryland congregation (into the charge) but they abandoned us. Here we were excluded and forgotten until Rev. Gross¹² came. He supplied us the first two years after he came to this country, on a week-day, but when he had enough, he abandoned us utterly. That is the forgetting, of which I said that it took place before.

“What was the cause we know not, for certain, but it is possible that at that time we were too weak, and it was too far for them, it is now much easier to reach us and we are certainly much stronger, for we constitute now fully a quarter and even more, yet we gave our fourth part just like Easton and the rest. This angered the people very much and they turned again to their former minister, Hecker. But, we always aimed hence it would be very difficult to serve them also with the preaching of the Gospel. But he would gladly do what was reasonable and occasionally preach for them.—*M. of C.*, May 5–6, 1763.

¹² Rev. John Daniel Gross was born at Webenheim in Zweibruecken and was educated at Marburg and Heidelberg. He was sent to Pennsylvania, landing in Philadelphia, December 4, 1764. He was ordained by Cœtus in 1765 and installed in the Egypt charge. In 1769 he began to serve the congregation of Saucon and Springfield. In 1773 he accepted a call to Kingston, N. Y., and the following year to the Reformed congregation. In connection with his duties, he served as professor in Columbia University. He died May 27, 1812.

At Whitehall Do. Gross found 94 members in the one congregation (Egypt); from the middle of December to May baptized 7 children, received 13 members. In the other congregation (Schlosser's), there are 78 members; children baptized 8, received as members, 7. In the congregation across the Jordan there are 73 members; 7 children baptized; 5 members received. In the fourth congregation, Allentown, there are 83 members; children baptized 6; received as members, 4. In five other shepherdless congregations, Lecha (Lehigh), Plainfield, at Droogeland (Dryland), Greenwich, Lindau, he baptized 43 children, and found over 300 members.—*M. of C.*, May 8–9, 1765.

Do. Gross has four regular and two irregular congregations. At Allentown 34 families, 9 members received, 18 baptized; Egypt 31 families, 12 members received, 7 baptized; at Schlosser's 23 families, 9 members received, 9 baptized, and across the Jordan 17 families, 12 members received, 12 baptized.

The Tresbacher (Dreisbach) and Lynn congregations embrace about 30 families, whom he serves on weekdays.—*M. of C.*, September 3–4, 1766.

how to strengthen ourselves. Thus it has continued until now, nor could it be otherwise because there are three churches here in a district of five miles and since they were so close together, that they have always been weak until now when more Germans have settled in Allen township. Now we have united with them. We are in the centre of the above mentioned three congregations. Two of the other congregations have united with us and those of Allen¹³ township. This fills us with good hope, for it is the strongest congregation of these three and nothing is lacking but a good minister, who knows how to unite his people and who himself is a leader of his flock, so that the Gospel may take root and increase as I have stated above.

“Furthermore I must tell you that now everything depends upon how we shall be cared for. Because you have to use diligence and make some efforts in order that the congregation may not be spoiled again or be neglected. Now I shall relate to you the beginning of this church and congregation, but as briefly as I can, in order that you may know the conditions here.

“First of all, I must name the three congregations. There is the Inschen Land (Indian Land) congregation, which is located at the Blue Mountains, on the Lehigh. Then there is our congregation, on the Inschen Creek (Indian Creek), at Jost Dreisbach,¹⁴ in the centre and the strongest Reformed

¹³ Allen Township was originally settled by Scotch Irish, but the Germans, being better farmers, gradually supplanted them.

¹⁴ Jost Dreisbach, the eldest son of Simon Dreisbach, Sr., was born in Obendorf, in 1723. He resided at Howerville and was a miller by trade. During the Revolution he owned and operated two mills in Lehigh township. He was one of the first commissioners of Northampton county, and in 1756, the period of the Indian uprising, gave his excuse for non-attendance at court, “I must grind wheat for the forts.” In 1774, he was a member of the “Committee of Observation” for Northampton county; in 1775, Captain of the Lehigh Company of Associators, and in October of the same year was appointed Colonel. On March 10, 1776, he was appointed Second Lieutenant in Mile’s Rifle Regiment and was captured, August 27, 1776, but on February 22, 1777, he enlisted again in Baron Von Otterndorf’s Light Infantry. He continued to serve the cause of Freedom until 1780. He died in 1794.

congregation and then there is the congregation in Moore township, where now Rev. Hecker¹⁵ still lives and preaches. The Indianland congregation has not more than eight or nine men (on the Reformed side) and these are almost half Lutheran. Even if they do their best, they cannot make up much (salary). Those of Moore township have more people, but they cannot make up even as much as those of Indianland. Then there is our old congregation which has also been unable to make up a large salary. From this it can be seen that these three congregations were too weak to keep up three churches and that they hardly make one good congregation. This we have known for a long time and both parties (denominations) always implored those of Moore township and those of Indianland to unite with us in our church, but it was never done until about two years ago, when the question was fully considered, especially because considerable number of Germans had settled in Allen township.

“Then they took counsel with some of the leading church

¹⁵ Rev. Johann Egidius Hecker and his twin brother Johann George was born January 26, 1726, in Dillenburg Massau. Their parents were Johann Wigand Hecker, equery, and his wife, Juliana. He studied theology at the University of Herborn. In 1751 he came to Pennsylvania and immediately began to supply vacant congregations. The following year (1752) he applied to the Cœtus for examination and ordination, “so that hereafter he might go on laboring with honor and quietness of conscience.” Cœtus replied that they had no authority to examine or ordain him and that according to the instructions from Holland they were compelled to ask him to cease his ministrations. He however continued his pastoral activities first independently of Cœtus and finally in opposition. He opened a record of baptisms, confirmations, marriages and burials at Tohickon, April 19, 1756, which continued until 1762. In addition to those of the Tohickon congregation he also records classes, confirmed at Heidelberg, Springfield, Saucon, in the Forcks near Easton, and Dryland. His name appears on the church register of the Upper Milford congregation in 1757. In 1762 he removed to Allen township and became the pastor of the three congregations of Indian Land, Indian Creek, and Moore township. Here, like in his previous field, his efforts seem to have met with little success; his health was failing and he is said to have died about 1774. According to the custom of the day he was buried within the chancel railing of the church. In 1873 the congregation erected a monument to his memory.

members in the three named congregations¹⁶ and for the first time our wish was fulfilled, that all should unite with those of Allen township to build a union church. I must mention some of these men. In the Indianland congregation there was Conrad Schneider,¹⁷ who lives now in Heidelberg, a schoolmaster. He was one of the first of the Indianland congregation (to agree to it), and he promised at once five pounds. But later when we had the whole congregation together to sign for it, he alienated the whole congregation again, after they had helped to buy the land for the Stone church, and after he had allowed himself to be elected architect, he caused the first confusion. Then there is Johannes Ditter, our old, above mentioned elder (Vorsteher), who gave his consent until we began to build, then he turned against us and that is still his position. Then some of Moore township, by the persuasion of Hecker, got the notion to build up their church again, but it is still uncertain.¹⁸

¹⁶ The Reverend Cœtus was asked for a minister by three congregations on the Lehigh. These three congregations thus far had irregular teachers, and were in no connection with the Reverend Cœtus; and because there is hope now that some good may be done among them by a regular minister, the Reverend Cœtus deemed it well to help them. It granted their request by allowing them to extend a regular call to a minister of the Reverend Cœtus. Until that time, they must be satisfied with the services of the neighboring ministers.—*M. of C.*, October 27–28, 1773.

¹⁷ “Conrad Schneider was schoolmaster and led the singing, but as he was no organist, he was requested to resign in 1786 and Jacob Strein became organist and schoolmaster.” *History of Egypt*, p. 24.

¹⁸ On April 14, 1774, Paul Flick and William Beck, trustees, purchased sixty-six acres of land from John Schneider, “for the joint or separate exercise and performance of public worship according to the usual Rites and Mode in the Lutheran and Reformed Calvinist persuasion and the instruction of their children in useful literature.”

Rev. Hecker was failing in health and soon died, and a new congregation, Big Moore township (Salem’s), was organized (1772), several miles further east. This so weakened the congregation that worship was abandoned. But the school was continued and the members met annually to elect trustees and through them to engage a schoolteacher and to care for the church property. The school had a large patronage, the enrollment oc-

“ Thus the beginning was made according to our desire, but then the enemy sowed more and more weeds among the wheat and now seeks to choke out the wheat, but thanks be to God that the congregation grows still and the church of God or the congregation is again rising and prospering under all this tempest of affliction, so that we are now able, if God be gracious to us to give us a regular minister, to give him a good salary; the people of Indianland see now that they have done wrong and those of Moore township do not know what they will do, because daily more are leaving them. For after you were here, several left them because they were touched by your sermon, although Hecker goes about daily trying to persuade people. He intends to hinder us at the Stone church, as much as he can, telling people that we would not get a minister from the Cœtus, for he and another man would thwart us from getting a congregation together. He may succeed in the latter in one respect, for Pitthan¹⁹ (John William Pythan) keeps us away from the Dryland congregation, as long as they will keep him, for that is the strongest congregation in the Forks, without it we have none on this side of the river which would be suitable for us, that is a congregation which could make up as

casionally reached ninety. It was known as the college. In 1848 forty acres were sold for \$4,000 and the proceeds used in 1850 in the erection of the present edifice known as Emanuel's Union Church, Petersville, Northampton Co.

¹⁹ Two congregations, Plainfield and Greenwich, and also the larger part of the congregation in Easton, which was served by Mr. Pithan, but are now entirely separated from him on account of his scandalous and offensive life and conduct. Many members of the congregation in Easton being well satisfied with his ministry, and not caring what kind of life Mr. Pithan led, separated from the other party, accepted him as their minister, and thus supported him in his scandalous life. In addition to serving the party in Easton, he serves another congregation, Dryland. But the two congregations mentioned above, and also the larger part of the congregation at Easton, will not have anything at all to do with Mr. Pithan. The congregation at Dryland, which belongs to the three congregations, was informed by letter that if in future they had any dealings with Mr. Pithan, the Reverend Cœtus would no longer regard them as a congregation of the Cœtus.—*M. of C.*, October 9–10, 1771.

much as ours and is also so located that it could unite with us. Hence I said above that you would have to show diligence and care for our new congregation in order that the weak be raised up, the idolent be encouraged, the stubborn be softened, those of little faith be comforted and the cold hearted be warmed up, so that the word which has begun to take root may also gain in strength and finally bear fruit. This we confidently expect and live in hope, that you will put forth your best endeavors to supply us, by preaching for us alternately, namely you yourself and Mr. Fawer (Faher) and Mr. Blumer and Mr. Steiner. If you will take the trouble to write to the other three to consult together about this, we think that they should preach for us a least once every four weeks until the meeting of Cœtus. We shall pay them amply for their services. If they will alternate it will hit none very frequently. If they are willing to supply us, it is better for them to agree among themselves, than for us to write to all the congregations which they serve. They can thereby save us much trouble.

“Mr. Blumer will come to preach here on the 17th of this month of January, now if you will write to Mr. Steiner to come the next time, four weeks later, and so forth, we shall know it and be governed by it as regards the Lutheran preachers.

“But enough for this time. I hope you will take nothing amiss in my letter. I have written a little more circumstantially so that you may understand more fully our condition and see how necessary it is to send good ministers to the Forks. May the Lord grant this to us in Jesus Christ, Amen. I am your servant ready to serve you and wishing your welfare.

“SIMON DREISBACH, JR.”²⁰

A member of the Stone Church, in Allen township, living in Lehigh township, Northampton county. Dated January —, 1773.

²⁰ Simon Dreisbach, Jr., was born in Obendorf, Wittgenstein, February 18, 1730. He was a delegate from Northampton county to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia (July 15, 1776) and which ratified the Declaration of Independence. For four successive years (1776–1780), he represented the county in the State Assembly and also several years as

Since the preparation of the above the following document has been discovered

On November 6, 1772, it was further resolved by the undersigned on the Reformed side as follows:—

We, the undersigned hereby attest, that since we have united with Moore township and Allen township to erect a union church²¹ and since the church is now finished and we have abandoned the church at Jost Dreisbach's we deem it reasonable that we shall have no further use for the church vessels here, but desire to transfer them to the new Stone church. And that we hereby transfer and hand over the same to the Stone church at the township line between Lehigh and Allen townships, namely; the baptismal dish, the chalice, the table cloth and the collection bags (glingel secklein) to be devoted there to the same use.

Jost Dreisbach, Heinrich Strauss, Conrad Bachman, Simon Dreisbach, Adam Dreisbach, Christian Lauffer.

A true copy made by me, Simon Dreisbach, February 1, 1781.

NORTHAMPTON, PA.

commissioner to collect blankets and provisions for the Continental soldiers, and from May 2, 1777, to October 20, 1783, was a member of the Council of Censors. After the close of the war he again represented the county in several sessions of the State Assembly. He was married to Dorothea, a daughter of Peter Doesius, in 1752. This union was blessed with twelve children of whom three sons, John, Jacob and George, served in the Revolutionary army. His first wife died in 1773 and he was married a second time to Maria Kuder, a widow, the daughter of Conrad Fox. He died near Kreidersville, December 17, 1806.

²¹ In this document no mention is made of Indian Land. At a meeting held May 20, 1771, the Lutheran and Reformed Congregations of Indian Land decided not to assist in the erection of a church at Indian Creek (Stone church) but to jointly erect a church at Indian Land, and also agreed to assist one another in the support of a pastor. Jacob Buchman and George Leibenguth (Reformed) and Bernhard Kuntz and Peter Anthony (Lutherans) were appointed a building committee, and Johann Dorn and Nicholas Schneider (Reformed) and Christopel Feigner and Jacob Keppel (Lutheran) were elected elders. The corner stone was laid in the spring of 1772 and on the 8th of November of the same year, the church, a log structure, was dedicated, at which time Rev. Christian Streit (Lutheran) and Rev. Johann Wilhelm Pithan (Reformed) officiated.

VI.

THE ETHICS OF THE DIVINE COMEDY.

JOHN LOVE BARNHART.

In writing the *Divine Comedy* Dante's purpose was avowedly ethical. In his letter to Can Grande, in which he gives the key to the interpretation of his immortal poem, Dante says: "The subject, then, of the whole work, taken according to the letter alone, is simply a consideration of the state of souls after death. . . . But if the work is considered according to its allegorical meaning [and this to the author was the real meaning] the subject is man, liable to the reward or punishment of Justice, according as through the freedom of the will he is deserving or undeserving."¹ "It can be briefly stated that the aim of the whole and of the part is to remove those living in this life from a state of misery and to guide them to a state of happiness. Now the kind of philosophy under which we proceed in the whole and in the part is moral philosophy or ethics; because the whole was undertaken not for speculation but for practice."²

While the *Divine Comedy* is far from being an abstract treatise on morality, under an inexhaustible wealth of imagery that is unsurpassed in vividness and forcefulness we find great moral truths of lasting benefit to mankind. Dante was not only one of the most gifted of all poets, but at the same time a master of ethical wisdom who deserves to rank as the first of moral poets. In all literature there is not a more nearly perfect work of art than this "miracle of song," yet it is art for life's sake. So marvelous were the genius and skill of the poet

¹ Dante's *Eleven Letters*, translated by Chas. S. Latham, p. 195.

² *Ibid.*, p. 199.

that the beauty and grandeur of the poem were not sacrificed in the carrying out of his didactic purpose.

The *Divine Comedy*, while mediaeval in its setting, is one of the very few universal books and has perennial significance. Here we are brought face to face with the universal problems of human experience that are fundamentally the same for all ages. The world in its outward aspects may change, old theories and doctrines give place to new, the sum of knowledge be increased, yet human nature remains essentially the same, and to the end of time must meet substantially the same grave questions concerning right and wrong. In his allegory of human life the Tuscan poet rises sufficiently above the limitations of his time to teach many moral truths that are as applicable to-day as they were six hundred years ago. The name Dante, a contraction from Durante, meaning enduring, permanent, was prophetic of his wonderful poem. Carlyle suggests that the *Divine Comedy* may be the most enduring thing Europe has yet produced.

In his *History of Ethics within Organized Christianity*, Professor Thomas C. Hall disposes of Dante by tersely saying: "Dante in Italy sang the scholasticism of Thomas of Aquinas in the entrancing strains of a native Italian, and mingled with mediæval Aristotelianism something of Cicero's ethics."³ To Thomas Aquinas, Aristotle and Cicero, in the order given, was Dante indebted more than to any others for the principles underlying his ethical teachings, but he did not slavishly follow any one of them. As the most learned man of his day who was indeed a marvel for his encyclopædic knowledge, he drew from various sources of moral wisdom, but he did more than put in poetic form the thoughts of other persons. He chose what he wanted from the material at hand, worked it over, and added to it. The *Divine Comedy* not only reveals the "terrible earnestness" of the author, but also his profound ethical insight and his originality as a moralist.

The fact that this poem is auto-biographic, is the history of

³ P. 369.

a soul struggling from sin through suffering and purification to the peace of heaven, adds to its human interest and makes it more easily understood. Dante, "a Florentine by birth, but not in morals," the idol of his pure, intense chivalric love for Beatrice shattered, in vain having sought consolation in philosophy, unjustly exiled through political intrigue from his native city nevermore to return, became, as he himself said, a wanderer, almost a beggar, "a ship without sail and without helm, drifted upon diverse ports and straits and shores by the dry wind that grievous poverty exhales."⁴ Rebuffs from without and misgivings within he endeavored "to solve the problem of his own life, to find intellectual and moral salvation."

In solving this problem, living as he did at a time when people who were religiously inclined had an overwhelming sense of eternity and emphasized other-worldiness, Dante tried to see the things of time under the aspect of eternity, to see the results of sin and virtue in their ultimate effects on the soul. Basing his whole ethical system on the freedom of the will, he shows by taking up one person after another, each one as the representative of some sin or virtue, what they eventually bring upon themselves.

Finding himself in the dark forest where the right way is lost Dante sees before him the Delectable Mountain which he desires to ascend, but as he endeavors to do so he is confronted with a leopard, a lion and a she-wolf, representing the sins of Incontinence, Violence and Fraud which must be overcome if the heights of the Mount of Virtue are to be reached. In order to deliver him from the seductions and errors of the world, Virgil at the instance of Beatrice leads Dante through hell that he may see that sin is worse than folly and realize what awful penalties it brings. Then is he conducted through purgatory that he may see how the penitent sinner may be purified, and finally into heaven that he may know of the bliss of those who are in the very presence of God. Virgil who typifies human reason is superseded as guide by Beatrice and

⁴ Convivio I, iii.

she in turn by Saint Bernard, both of whom are symbolic of revealed truth.

In the *Divine Comedy* in a most striking manner is brought home to us the truth that what a man does reacts on himself, that if he does wrong he injures himself and that if he does right he reaps the benefit of his righteous acts. "The soul creates the atmosphere in which it lives, and builds for itself a mansion or a dungeon according as its deeds are good or evil."⁵

To Dante evil was evil and good good, the two being polar opposites, the difference very decided and forever fixed. All worldly distinctions disappear. In the *Inferno* he strips evil of all its masks that it may be seen in its real nature, in all its hideousness.

"How many are esteemed great kings up there
Who here shall be like unto swine in mire,
Leaving behind them horrible dispraises!"⁶

Towards evil it is impossible to be neutral. The first sad company met with inside the gate the inscription on which sounds like the tolling of a funeral bell are the non-committals, the ones who have taken no definite stand either for good or evil. With scathing sarcasm the author speaks of these irresolute, indifferent ones, who drifted through life the easiest way, who "never were alive." James Russell Lowell had the same class of people in mind when he wrote:

"God hates your sneakin' creturs that believe
He'll settle things they run away an' leave."⁷

His threefold division of sins in the *Inferno* into Incontinence, Violence and Fraud Dante derived from Aristotle and Cicero. Instead of following Aristotle's classification as a whole which is Vice, Incontinence and Brutality,⁸ Dante omits

⁵ *Teachings of Dante*, by C. A. Dinsmore, p. 91.

⁶ Longfellow's *Inf.*, VIII, 49-51.

⁷ *Biglow Papers*, VI.

⁸ *Vide Nichomachean Ethics*, VII, i.

Brutality or Bestiality, and, as Dr. Edward Moore shows⁹ borrows from Cicero the distinction between crimes of Violence and those of Fraud, the latter being much worse because they are due to a perversion of reason.

The lower the descent into hell the more heinous the sins and the more severe the punishments. In the upper circles are the incontinent, or the sensual, those who failed to restrain their appetites and passions, as the wantons, the gluttons, etc. Further down in the infernal regions, in the city of Dis, are those who have committed sins of Violence, sins of vicious habits, who have done wrong against their neighbors, themselves and against God. Still lower in the scale of iniquity, in the third and most horrible part of hell are those who have been guilty of Fraud and Treachery. In the lowest depths is Satan himself. As sin estranges from God the evil one, in Dante's conception of the material universe, is even locally as far as possible away from God.

The punishment is not arbitrarily inflicted in an external way, but such as the sinner has brought upon himself. Dante follows the principle laid down in Wisdom of Solomon, XI. 16, "Wherewithal a man sinneth, by the same also shall he be punished." By his sins and not for them is man punished. Hell is to live in the evil character one has created for oneself and to suffer its consequences.

One of the most remarkable things about the *Inferno* is the congruence of sins and punishments. The penalty naturally grows out of the sin. Different kinds of sinners suffer in different ways and in ways most appropriate for them. For instance, those who have yielded to their passions, the carnal sinners are in the darkness hurled about by a mighty hurricane. (Here is also reflected the sinner's state of mind when the sins were committed.) The wrathful smite and mangle one another. The murderers are in a river of boiling blood. The suicides are deprived of their bodies. The flatterers are sub-

⁹ *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, pp. 157-60.

merged in sickening ordure. The hypocrites are painted, wearing gilded cloaks heavy as lead, wearisome mantles for eternity. The thieves who plied their sneaking trade changing disguises are turned from human to reptilian form. The schismatics are themselves rent asunder. Some of the worst sinners are in arctic cold, frozen in ice, because sin is paralyzing.

Dante localized hell, but as he at the same time taught that it is an environment the soul brings upon itself it was in his conception more of a state or condition of the soul than a place. Sin in its development is hell. As long as a person is dominated by evil he can say, "What matter where, if I be still the same,"¹⁰ and, "Which way I fly is hell: myself am hell."¹¹ Marlowe in *Faustus* said:

"Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed
In one self place; for where we are is hell,
And where hell is there we must ever be."

We know as much, or perhaps it were better to say, we know as little about the future hell as did Dante, but taken in a moral sense his teachings come to us in this twentieth century with tremendous force. Here is a message of vast import for those in our day who make light of sin and trifle with it. People may question the existence of a future hell, but they can have no doubt about the hell that some persons make for themselves in this present life. Many a one has experiences as torturing as Margarete in Goethe's *Faust*. Led astray, betrayed, an unintentional accomplice in the death of her mother, indirectly the cause of the death of her brother, in deep disgrace, in intense agony, she exclaims: "Welche Höllenpein!" Of the men involved in the looting of the state treasury in connection with the erection of the new capitol building in recent years in one of our eastern states, nine, according to the reports of the daily press, came prematurely

¹⁰ *Paradise Lost*, I, 256.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 75.

to their graves soon after the exposure of the crime, one by suicide, and the others because they could not bear up under the ignominy. In addition to these one became insane. From an editorial which appeared in *The Outlook*, July 12, 1913, we quote the following: "There is a great deal of flippant talk about the abolition of hell. It seems to be the impression of many people that the possibility of suffering, symbolized by a material place of torment, has been eliminated from human life. As a matter of fact, hell, in the sense of inevitable and unmistakable punishment, is to-day far more a reality than it has ever been before. Whatever may be the sufferings through which men must go in the future in order to be purged of impurity, there is no question about the sufferings which they undergo in this present life. The answer of the man who was asked if he believed in hell, 'I do not believe in it; I know it because I am in it,' is a terse statement of what may be called the modern view of punishment for sin." No, Dante was not the only one of whom it could be said, "There goes the man who has been in hell."

But whether or not hell is eternal in the sense Dante believed it to be is another question. Dr. Philip Schaff once said: "The doctrine of eternal punishment is the most awful that can be conceived of. The more we think of it the more we shrink from it, and the more we desire to escape from it."¹² It was easier for Dante and his contemporaries who emphasized the kingship of God and divine justice to accept this doctrine than it is for us who have come to think of God as love. Since it is the nature of sin, lust, hate, malice, wrath, fraud, to be self-destructive, how can it last forever? Is it too much to say that God is eternal because He is love, and that only what is associated with love can be eternal?

Is there no such thing as repentance in hell and therefore an escape from its torments? Not in Dante's hell for all there are rebellious. Instead of acknowledging that they were in the least to blame for their condition,

¹² *Literature and Poetry*, p. 376.

“God they blasphemed and their progenitors,
The human race, the place, the time, the seed
Of their engendering and of their birth!”¹³

The more bitter and the more hard-hearted they become the longer they suffer. There is no remorse, no signs of sorrow for sins committed. So Dante is consistent when he places as a part of the inscription over the gate of hell: “All hope abandon, ye who enter in.”

We are accustomed to thinking that much and perhaps most suffering for wrong doing is caused by pangs of conscience, by a sense of guilt. Shakespeare discloses no worse hell into which the wicked plunge themselves than the scourgings of an outraged conscience. Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are haunted night and day by the crimes which they cannot wash from their blood-stained hands. The conscience of Claudius, king of Denmark, is so torturing that he cannot witness the play to the end. Richard III, his crimes threatening him with dire vengeance, cries out:

“My conscience has a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
And every tale condemns me for a villain.”

There is hope for such as these, but the persons in Dante's hell are beyond remorse, the conflict between sin and righteousness is past and they are entirely in the domain of evil. In these modern times, however, we are not so quick to say that persons can get so deep in sin that a moral change for the better is impossible.

As a good churchman of his time Dante believed in and strongly defended the papacy, but he dealt with the individual popes with the same stern impartiality that he dealt with all other persons. Their office did not save them from suffering for their evil deeds. Dante in his journey through hell found several of them there, and the then reigning pope was soon expected to reach that woeful place. Sins forgiven other persons

¹³ Longfellow's *Inf.*, III, 103-05.

by popes are not really forgiven unless those persons truly repent. Guido da Montefeltro was by the pope promised absolution for his fraudulent council only to learn in hell that he

“Who repents not cannot be absolved,
Nor can one both repent and will [to commit sin] at once,
Because of the contradiction which consents not.”¹⁴

Even popes must conform to the same high moral standard as others. Manfred, king of Sicily, died excommunicated, but was not among the lost.

In passing from the Inferno to the Purgatorio where Dante sings “of that second realm where the human spirit is purified, and becomes worthy to ascend to heaven,” there is a very noticeable change in the tone and spirit of the poem. While the descent into the dark pit is a picture of moral degeneration the ascent through purgatory is the vision of moral redemption and emancipation. In the first realm there is increasing gloom, here there is increasing light. The people in the infernal regions are characterized by selfishness and rebelliousness, those in purgatory by a desire to get rid of sin and attain salvation. Here the punishment is not penal but purifying; neither is it degrading but suitable for the improvement of the sinner.

This more than any other part of the trilogy corresponds to the present actual life, and is nearer to our own experience. “Our life here is not a heaven of realization, nor a hell of failure and death, but a purgatory of endless climbing.” In giving his conceptions of how persons get rid of sin and are made perfect through suffering Dante treats subjects that are of vital concern to us all.

Our author believed that no one can be saved apart from Christ. As a consistent churchman of his time he consigned to hell, though he did so reluctantly, all unbaptized persons, even children, and adults who lived virtuously but without faith in Christ.

¹⁴ *Inf.*, XXVII, 118-20.

As Dante comes to purgatory he sees four stars which typify prudence, temperance, fortitude and justice, the four cardinal virtues which are sufficient to start men in the right way but not to bring them into the kingdom of God. As the law was a school-master to lead to Christ so the practice of the cardinal virtues was a preparation for the higher Christian morality the chief virtues of which are faith, hope and charity without which heaven cannot be attained. Virgil, referring to limbo, the place of his eternal abode said:

“There dwell I among those who the three saintly
Virtues did not put on, and without vice
The others knew and followed all of them.”¹⁵

In accordance with the teachings of the Church Dante believed that good works as well as faith are necessary to prepare for the realm celestial. For the formation of a strong character he was right in emphasizing good works, personal effort, as well as faith. Who does not feel, for instance, that what such a person as Belacqua “who seemed to me weary, was seated, and was clasping his knees, holding his face down between them,”¹⁶ “more indolent than if sloth were his sister,” so lazy, so overcome by his wonted mood that he scarcely raised his head in speaking,—who does not feel that what such a one needs is the discipline of a strenuous life, of vigorous personal effort? So with the person who has sinned. Besides the mercy and grace of God he needs the moral stamina which comes through earnest endeavor.

As Dante passes through purgatory many ask him to pray for them or request him to ask their friends to pray for them. The poet is in danger of being thus detained in his journey. Virgil says to him: “Do thou still go on, and in going listen.”¹⁷ Keep on climbing, but listen to these requests while you proceed. He must not stop to do for others what they should do for themselves. He is to keep on climbing and as

¹⁵ *Purgatorio*, VII, 34–36.

¹⁶ Norton's *Purgatory*, IV, 106–09.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, V, 45.

he goes lend a hand to those who are helping themselves. Edward Howard Griggs calls this the high water mark of mediæval ethics.

The nearer one reaches the top of the mount of purification the easier is the ascent. The longer one does the right the less difficult it is to do it.

Dante's conception of purgatory differs in some important respects from the popular idea of the Middle Ages and from the teachings and practices of the Roman Church. His teachings are on a higher plain. He recognizes the twofold purpose of purgatory: (1) the purifying of the soul from the stains of sin and the subduing of self so that the will is in harmony with God, and (2) the making of satisfaction by suffering for sins committed, by the payment of temporal penalty. But contrary to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas and the Church of his day he persistently lays stress on purification. The Church made much of indulgences at that time, but Dante does not refer to them except to protest against them.

An important part of the process by which a soul becomes purified is shown in canto IX. The three steps there described that are to be ascended symbolize the three successive steps in penance. The first of white and polished marble is symbolic of sincere confession, the second of a dark purple, rough scorched stone, cracked lengthwise and athwart symbolizes contrition, and the third of porphyry as flaming red as blood, according to Dr. Edward Moore, burning love.¹⁸ According to the Roman Church the three steps are confession, contrition and satisfaction, and some scholars interpret the flaming blood-red porphyry as symbolic of satisfaction. However that may be interpreted Dante emphasizes the inward condition of the heart more than the outward acts. With him the question is not, How much sin has the sinner committed and how much vindictive punishment must he endure; rather is it, What evil is still in his heart and how can he get rid of it and its ill

¹⁸ Vide *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, p. 47.

effects, for the pardon of sins does not mean the remission of consequences.

As Dante ascends these steps he smites upon his breast three times in penitence for sins in thought, in word and in deed, and seven P's are inscribed upon his forehead. The seven P's (Peccata) signify the seven mortal sins, or rather the bad dispositions out of which they spring, which must be purged away. These are pride, envy, anger, sloth, avarice, gluttony and lust. This classification Dante adopted from such writers as Bonaventura and Brunetto Latini and not from Thomas Aquinas whose was the same except that he placed avarice before sloth.

There has been much discussion about the classification of sins in the Inferno in comparison with that in the Purgatorio. Both are much alike and yet are not the same. Both resemble each other in this respect that the sins increase in gravity the lower down they are. At the same time there are marked differences. In the Inferno pride, envy and sloth do not appear. (Some commentators claim they are there in disguise.) In Purgatorio more than half the sins of the Inferno, those that are the worst, are not mentioned.

Dante probably never intended the two classifications to be the same. For practical purposes in connection with indulgences and penances the Church had made a classification of sins in purgatory and this our author followed. But no such classification had been made of the sins in hell, and there Dante was free to follow his own inclinations and judgment.

In the Purgatorio the forms of suffering or punishment are those which are most suitable for corrective discipline, and appropriate subjects are presented for meditation. The proud are bowed down under heavy weights. The envious have their eyes closed and habitually speak well of others. The wrathful are in gloom and smoke. The slothful, "moving at a run," are in continual restless motion. The avaricious are prostrated on the earth with face downward, sighing and weeping. The gluttonous are emaciated and have constant hunger and thirst.

The lustful are burning in fire purging away their iniquity. And all seven classes of penitents have brought to their attention instances which show the folly and the heinousness of the particular sin from which they are being cleansed and then examples which show the excellence of the opposite virtue they are to cultivate. All are submissive and willingly endure their suffering that they may as soon as possible be purified. The slothful in their quick movements do not wish to pause to converse with Dante. The lustful are careful not to come out where they will not be burned.

As Dante ascends from one ledge of the mount of purgatory to another and is cleansed from the seven mortal sins the P's by which they were represented are removed from his brow. After all have disappeared and he is about to enter paradise Virgil says to him: "Free upright, and sound is thine own will, and it would be wrong not to act according to its choice; wherefore thee over thyself I crown and mitre."¹⁹ Now that he has become morally pure he is master of himself. Liberty which has been his quest is at last found. It is not a gift, but an achievement; it is at the summit and not at the base of the mountain, and is attained by the subduing of self through toil and conflict and suffering.

The freeing of the soul from each type of sin is celebrated by a song, the singing of a beatitude, the last one being, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." All are free from jealousy and rejoice in the progress of others. Whenever a penitent finishes one stage of his discipline and ascends to a better and larger life the whole mountain trembles in sympathetic joy and all in thanksgiving join in singing, "Gloria in Excelsis Deo."

In the Paradiso, which is preëminently the poem of light, of music and of motion, and which Shelley has called "a perpetual hymn of everlasting love," our author tells how, after his purification, he mounts upward to the highest heaven where he beholds the heavenly host in the form of a pure white rose

¹⁹ Norton's *Purgatorio*, XXVII, 140-43.

and in the beatific vision is even permitted to have a glimpse through His effulgence of the First Love, the Eternal Light. In describing the different heavens through which he passes he endeavors to give some conception of the realm celestial, but his chief object is to show the beauty of holiness, to reveal the blessedness of the righteous, to portray the spiritual life in its perfection. In his inability to do this to his satisfaction he exclaims: "O joy! O ineffable gladness! O life entire of love and of peace! O riches secure, without longing!"²⁰

As this man "who breathes the mysterious air of the eternal world" ascends from one heaven to another he converses with the persons whom he meets about their conditions and surroundings, and also about the practical affairs of the life of men on earth. Even here he is not so much taken up with "other-worldliness" that he forgets the needs of the present world, but repeatedly gives expression to ethical truths that are meant to be helpful in daily life. For instance, he discourses about the making and keeping of vows. He calls attention to the pettiness of many worldly ambitions when looked upon from the heights above. In the *Paradiso* (Cantos XXVII and XXIX), are his strongest passages against the abuses of the papacy and the evil practices of the priests.

When Dante inquires how it is possible for those in the lower heavens to be content when there are higher heavens yet unattained, he receives as an answer, "His will is our peace." As long as it was God's will that they should be in that place they were satisfied. To us life means endless growth, a growth which continues in eternity as well as in this life. Unless a soul has undergone some miraculous change, has been fixed by divine alchemy, we in our day cannot understand how it can stop growing and advancing and still be contented.

Dante accepts the mediæval idea of the superiority of the contemplative to the active life. The former was believed to be better than the latter for the reason that, "The contemplative life directly and immediately appertains to the love of

²⁰ Norton's *Paradiso*, XXVII, 7-9.

God, whereas the active life is more directly ordered to the love of our neighbor."²¹ But to the contemplative life man cannot attain unless he has first passed through the active life. Those who passed into the contemplative are the ones who are nearest God. Such teachings are ascetical, and, of course, contrary to our present day beliefs. But do we not often go to the other extreme, lay too much stress on activity and devote too small a portion of our time to meditation?

Besides being too ascetic the Ethics of the Divine Comedy is legalistic rather than evangelical. Another criticism is that Dante's ethics is too individualistic. The mediæval world was stationary. The existing order of things was taken as a matter of course. Little thought was given to the improvement of social environments. Like others of his time Dante was not thinking how social conditions could be improved, but how individuals could become better and gain entrance into the heavenly kingdom.

Because Dante manifested a strong dislike for things unreal and mechanical in religion, attached much importance to the inner, spiritual life, and opposed the temporal power of the papacy and denounced its abuses, he has been called the first great Reformer. That is not the best way to designate him, but it can be said that he was the greatest moral and religious teacher of his time and one of the greatest of all time, and the prophet of a higher and more ethical form of Christianity.

BALTIMORE, MD.

²¹ Aquinas Ethicus, translated from the second part of the *Summa Theologica*, Jos. Rickaby, Vol. II, p. 388.

VII.

PHILIP SCHAFF, PROPHET AND PIONEER OF CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE MANIFEST- TATION OF UNITY.¹

RUFUS W. MILLER.

A special meeting of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church, formerly German Reformed, held at Lebanon, Pa., in January, 1843, appointed the Rev. Dr. Hoffeditz, of German birth and as polite as a courtier, and the Rev. Dr. Schneck, a fine specimen of a native American German, a committee to proceed to Germany to secure a theological professor. They called at the study of a young man who shortly before had entered upon his work as an instructor in the theological faculty of Berlin. The committee informed this young man that the theological professors of Halle and Berlin, especially Tholuck, Julius Müller and Neander had unanimously directed them to him as a suitable person to fill the German professorship in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, then located at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.

The mission of this committee excited considerable attention by its novelty and because of the prospect which it seemed to open, of the transplantation of German theology to America. King Frederick William IV. invited the delegates to the palace, approved of their choice and showed his practical interest by a liberal gift of \$1,500.

¹ Acknowledgment is herewith made of material and statements from the leaflets of the Christian Unity Foundation, *The Reunion of Christendom*, by Dr. Philip Schaff; addresses and articles by Robert E. Speer, Bishop Anderson, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, Dean Shailer Mathews, Dr. H. K. Carroll; articles in the *Constructive Quarterly*, *The Life of Philip Schaff*, by David S. Schaff, D.D., etc.

It may be well to remember that the House of Hohenzollern is originally German Reformed and still uses the Heidelberg Catechism, though strictly devoted to the Evangelical Union of the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions since the Third Centennial of the German Reformation.

The young professor, Rev. Philip Schaff, in December, 1843, received the official call and in the spring of 1844 left Berlin, and, after spending seven weeks in London and Oxford, making the personal acquaintance of the leaders of the Tractarian Movement and the leaders of the Broad Church School, sailed for America.

In October of that year, he delivered his inaugural address in the First Reformed Church, Reading, Pa., on the "Principle of Protestantism." It was a vindication of the Reformation on the theory of progressive historical development, which was then regarded as dangerous but is now very generally accepted.

Dr. Schaff spent twenty years in the institutions of the Reformed Church. In 1864 he removed to New York, became secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, serving until 1870. From 1869 until his death, he was closely identified with Union Theological Seminary, occupying the chairs at various times, of theology, biblical exegesis, biblical language and of church history.

It is significant that the immediate cause of his death, October 20, 1893, was his journey to the Parliament of Religions where, on September 22, he said:

"I was warned by physicians and friends not to come to Chicago. They said it might kill me, but I was determined to bear my last dying testimony to the cause of Christian Union in which I have been interested all my life. As sure as God is God and as sure as Christ is 'The Way, the Truth and the Life,' his word shall be fulfilled and there will be one flock and one shepherd."

It may be well to quote from a few of the congratulatory addresses given to Dr. Philip Schaff on the occasion of his

fiftieth anniversary as a teacher, in 1892. They set forth, comprehensively, his work as a theological mediator, uniter of Christians, prophet and pioneer of unity. The theological faculty of the University of Berlin wrote:

“Like Martin Bucer, who three hundred years before you had crossed over to England to carry thither the light of German theological science, you went over to the New World to sow there the seeds of the same culture, and thus became, through your tireless and richly blessed work, the Theological Mediator between the East and the West. If to-day the famous Theological Seminaries in the United States have become nurseries of theological science, so that the old world no longer gives to them alone, but receives from them instruction in turn, this is owing chiefly to your activity.

“You have introduced into your new Fatherland in English translations an array of valuable and weighty works in German theology, thus naturalizing there that science and causing it to be appreciated.

“This, however, forms but a small part of your great and fruitful work. You have advanced the science of Theology by works both in German and English, particularly by your great works, the *History of the Apostolic Church*, the *History of the Christian Church* and the *Bibliotheca Symbolica Ecclesia Universalis (The Creeds of Christendom)*, together with numerous treatises on subjects pertaining to church history, which are the fruits of your independent studies. Your *Church History* in particular has taken a most honorable rank among the church histories of the day, by virtue of the thoroughness of its execution and the clearness of its style. It is the most notable monument of universal historical learning produced by the School of Neander.

“In addition to this, and thereby resembling the great Mediator between the Greek and the Latin Church in the past, you have shown the most lively interest in both the original text of the New Testament and its translation into English. Your *Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*

has become a very useful hand-book. And as president of the American Bible Revision Committee in coöperation with the English Committee, you have played a most prominent part in bringing that great work to a happy conclusion.

“But, like Jerome, your aim was not to introduce into one country the theological conflicts of another, nor to draw party lines of doctrine as strictly as possible, but, on the contrary, you have ever made it your task to promote reconciliation, to draw together the various parties in the Church, and everywhere to bring about ‘The speaking of the truth in love.’

“If the signs of the times do not deceive us, your work in this regard also has been crowned with special blessings. The various Evangelical denominations of your new home are indeed drawing nearer to one another, and their ecclesiastical and scholarly emulation no longer minister to strife, but to mutual recognition and coöperation.”

The faculty and board of directors of Union Theological Seminary, New York, said among other things:

“In the great department which you now represent in this institution—that of church history—it is gratifying to us to know that your work is recognized, appreciated and respected on both sides of the Atlantic. In your numerous contributions to biblical exegesis, you have contemplated not only the needs of the professional student, but also those of the layman; so that your commentaries have a place at the fireside as well as in the minister’s library. While you have expounded the *creeds of Christendom* for maturer minds, you have made *catechisms* for the children. You have prepared manuals of holy song for the sanctuary and hymnals for the little ones. Through at least six translations from the original you have vindicated the claims of the divine power of our Lord and Saviour in Germany, France, Holland, Greece, Russia and Japan. You have made the Church acquainted with the biographies of saintly men and of Christian scholars, and have illustrated and rendered available the writings of the *Christian Fathers*. The great work of Bible revision is largely indebted

to your labor. You have wrought for a better understanding and a closer union among the sects of Christendom, and for the preservation and promotion of the observance of the Lord's Day, especially among our vast German population."

And Chancellor MacCracken of the University of New York, well said:

"From the beginning of your career as a teacher, fifty years ago, in Berlin, to this hour, you have been her loyal son, her faithful steward, bringing from the treasury of history and the Bible things new and old, making every Christian denomination and minister the richer and happier through the treasures which you have amassed, and which you have scattered in tens of thousands of pages with liberal hand. While independent, and even daring in your theology and philosophy, you have so combined the sweetness of manner with courage of soul that you are to-day beloved by conservative and progressive alike."

And in the greeting from Yale University the statement is properly made:

"During all this period you have been engaged in bringing into closer mutual acquaintance the scholars of Europe and America. We are glad to recognize the Catholic spirit and kindly temper which have marked your literary career."

The Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church gave welcome and greeting when Dr. Schaff attended the meeting at Lancaster, Pa., October 24, 1892, and said, among other things, in the report of the special committee, Rev. Dr. Thomas G. Apple, chairman:

"Dr. Schaff needs no introduction to this body. For nearly a quarter of a century he occupied the chair of church history in the Theological Seminary under the care of this Synod, and along with Rauch and Nevin contributed so much in developing the life and genius of our Reformed Church. Although for years he has been partially separated from us, yet we have followed with deep interest and laudable pride his career in the great work he has accomplished by his distinguished talents

and arduous labors for the entire Christian Church, both in Europe and America, until he stands to-day, in the front of Church historians since the days of the great Neander, with whom in his early life he was associated as professor."

The larger part of the practical labors of Dr. Schaff, including fourteen trips abroad, was in connection with the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance, of which he was the foremost spirit, and in promoting the Alliance of the Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, which organization was the pioneer and pattern for the Pan-Methodist Conference, The International Congress of Congregationalists and other family, denominational gatherings.

These have been the necessary forerunners without which the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America could not have come into being.

Dr. Schaff also attended the Old Catholic Union and Conference at Bonn in 1875 where agreement was urged upon a doctrinal basis of fourteen articles and the settlement of the filioque controversy, by some of the ablest and most learned dignitaries of the Old Catholic, the Orthodox Greek and Russian and the Anglican Churches. These important conclusions of the Bonn Conference have not been officially ratified by any of the Eastern or Anglican Churches but may be revived or acted upon at some future time.

Dr. Schaff dealt with the subject of Christian Unity often in essay, in address at home and abroad. A number of these papers are included in his book, *Christ and Christianity*. Perhaps the most remarkable document that has yet appeared from the standpoint of wealth of historical learning, clearness of statement, the spirit of love and prophetic vision, on the subject of Christian unity, is Dr. Schaff's paper on the "Reunion of Christendom," prepared for the Parliament of Religions and the National Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Chicago, September and October, 1893. It is not possible here to give more than a brief résumé of this paper, which was characterized by Dr. Henry Jessup of Beirut, as "Apostolic.

One of the most Christ-like utterances in all church history." His hope was to present clearly and faithfully the lessons of history rather than any personal views on the great problem of the "Reunion of Christendom" on the basis of Christ, His Gospel of Love and Peace. I am indebted to Dr. David Schley Schaff, in his biography of his father, for the summarizing of this paper. After expressing the conviction that ultimately God will unite all his children in one flock and under one shepherd, he took up the different kinds of Christian union and pronounced the union demanded by the Pope, upon the basis of submission to him, an impossibility.

"He then urged confederate union between allied Protestant communions. As for the Chicago-Lambeth proposals, so called, he declared the 'historic episcopate' an insuperable stumbling-block to all non-Episcopalians, which will never be conceded by them as a condition of church unity if it is understood to mean the necessity of three orders of the ministry and of episcopal ordination in unbroken historic succession. Christ says nothing about bishops any more than about patriarchs and popes, and does not prescribe any particular form of church government. . . . 'Let us learn something from history. All respect for the historic episcopate. It goes back in unbroken lines almost to the beginning of the second century, and no one can dispute its historical necessity or measure of usefulness. But God has also signally blessed the Lutheran, the Presbyterian and the Congregational ministry for many generations, with every prospect of growing usefulness for the future; and what God has blessed no man should lightly esteem. The non-Episcopal churches will never unchurch themselves, and will only negotiate on the basis of equality and a recognition of the validity of their ministry. Each denomination must offer its idol on the altar of reunion.'

"He went on to make a bold surmisal. Should the federation of the Protestant churches be accomplished, the greater work would still remain to be done. If any one church is to be the center of unification, the honor must be conceded to the

Greek or the Roman communion. But will Rome ever make concessions to the truth of history? Dr. Schaff replied that he hoped she would.

“What if the pope, in the spirit of the first Gregory and under the inspiration of a higher authority, should infallibly declare his own fallibility in all matters lying outside of his own communion, and invite Greeks and Protestants to a fraternal pan-Christian council in Jerusalem, where the mother-church of Christendom held the first council of reconciliation and peace! But whether in Jerusalem or Rome, or (as Cardinal Wiseman thought) in Berlin, or (as some Americans think) on the banks of the Mississippi, the war between Rome and Constantinople, and between Rome, Wittenberg, Geneva and Oxford, will be fought out to a peaceful end, when all the churches shall be thoroughly Christianized and all the creeds of Christendom unified in the creed of Christ.”

“After illustrating by historic examples the idea that the church must adjust her methods to the new social problems and her doctrinal statements to the established results of biblical and historical criticism and natural science, he brought forward five means for promoting Christian union. These are the cultivation of an irenic and evangelical catholic spirit, the personal intercourse of Christians of all denominations, co-operation in Christian and philanthropic work, the study of church history in an unpartisan spirit and prayer offered in the spirit of the Lord’s sacerdotal prayer. The paper closed with a glowing tribute to the various communions of Christendom from the Greek and Latin churches down to the Salvation Army, the members of which are good Samaritans, an honor to the name of Christ and a benediction to a lost world. We welcome to the reunion of Christendom all denominations which have followed the divine Master and have done His work. Let us forget and forgive their sins and errors, and remember only their virtues and merits. There is room for all these churches and societies in the kingdom of God.”

The large-heartedness, the open and tolerant mind and the

optimistic spirit of Dr. Schaff, pervades this paper. Naturally, therefore, he lays stress upon the case of Peter and Paul at the Council of Jerusalem, as a scriptural record for the movement of reconciliation, starting with the Pope. His Christo-centric Theology caused him to magnify personal attachment to Christ as the only tie to an abiding union in the family of Christian believers. His use of the prayer of our Lord as a text and constant reference to it, is justified because *he felt his safe ground for the assurance of the reunion of Christendom lies in His atoning sacrifice and His intercession.*

We believe Dr. Bright, the veteran editor of the chief organ of the American Baptist churches, *The Examiner*, at the time of the death of Dr. Schaff, declared the truth when he said,—“Philip Schaff did more than any other man of his time to promote Christian Unity.” Speaking as a member of the Catholic communion, Dr. Shahan, of the Catholic University at Washington, uses the following words, before the American Society of Church History:

“On different occasions Dr. Schaff, it is remembered with gratitude by Catholics, corrected misstatements of their doctrines and rebuked exaggerated and false notions concerning them. . . . He belongs in the same category with men like George Calixtus, Grotius and Leibnitz, whose efforts for the reunion of Christians the Catholic Church remembers with sympathy, while she regrets their untimely failure. . . . When the Catholic historian and theologian considers his natural and acquired abilities, his earnest zeal, his manliness, his astounding productivity, he is tempted to exclaim:

“‘Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses.’”

How very appropriate that the “Reunion of Christendom” was the very last interest of a public nature that engaged the mind and heart of Dr. Schaff; for his closing hours were occupied in reading the communications which he had solicited on the subject as treated from divines at home and in Europe and in arranging the paper “*The Reunion of Christendom*” with comments thereon for the printer.

Surely all will agree that Dr. Schaff was a great pioneer of Christian unity and, likewise, his labors as represented in the organizations he helped to form, made him a prophet of the present time; for he believed that the first step in the direction of the Union of Churches is the confederation of the several branches of those denominations which profess the same creed.

We believe that the organic union, both of families of denominations and of national church bodies, as well as the reunion of Christendom, must come to pass first through Federation and then Organic Union of denominational families. The words now becoming familiar: "Not compromise but comprehension; not uniformity but unity" may well be the rallying cry. Inter-communion between all the disciples of Christ; co-operation in missions, social service, education, evangelism; fellowship in the faith which, through all the ages since Christ ascended, His spirit has been showing in the mind of His church; and a ministry in His name so validated and attested that without violence to the scruples of any it may prove acceptable to all,—these are among the objects to be sought for until they shall be attained in the fulfillment of the Lord's last prayer for the oneness of His disciples, that the world may believe on Him.

It may be well to note briefly, as contributing to the argument of "Manifestation of Unity," the progress which has been made in the organic union of churches.

The organic union between the Lutheran and German Reformed Churches, into which German Protestantism has been divided since the sixteenth century, was effected in 1817. The name of the UNITED EVANGELICAL CHURCH was substituted for the two separate denominational names but freedom was allowed to retain the Lutheran or Reformed creed or to use the Augsburg Confession or Heidelberg Catechism according to preference.

The question of union is not an absorptive but a conservative union of the two confessions, under the same government and administration.

The union of the old and new school of Presbyterians in 1869 and 1870 furnishes an example of organic union. So, likewise, the four divisions of Presbyterians in Canada have been united in one organization since 1875, while since 1874 the five independent bodies of Methodists in Canada have worked together as one organization and practically since 1908 the Baptists and the Free Baptists in this country have been united in strict conformity to their congregational polity.

A word as to present movements toward organic union,—since the actual union of the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland took place in 1900, the union of the United Free Church and the Church of Scotland is well under way, with good prospects of success. In Canada it is altogether likely the Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist churches will soon be united in one body and in our own country progress is being made toward unification of families of churches on the part of the Presbyterian and Reformed, the Methodist family, the Congregationalist and Baptist, The United Brethren and Methodist Protestant, the Evangelical and United Evangelical, etc., and plans of union, more or less fully realized, have been put into operation in China, Japan, India, Korea and other foreign missionary countries.

In Australia since 1906 efforts have been making between the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania and by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, to become one body; and in the State of Victoria there has been established the Melbourne College of Divinity, representing officially the Church of England, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Congregational and the Baptist churches. The resolutions setting forth the basis of union which have been under discussion and which have been considered in this country informally between representatives of various denominations are significant. They hold the Holy Scriptures in the Old and New Testament to be the rule and ultimate standard of faith in all matters necessary to salvation, accept the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, as expressing

the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith and as an adequate basis for any other formulated statement of Christian faith which may be needed; recognize the two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord, administered with the use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

Recognize that from the very early times there was one common succession of orders and that since that time the practice of ordination has been continued and the act of ordination has been performed (*a*) in the Anglican Church by a bishop and presbyter and (*b*) in the Presbyterian Church by a presbyter presided over by a moderator, etc.

That the Union purposes to recognize the ministers of both churches and that in the United Church the authority to execute their office shall be equal.

That some form of individual superintendence shall be conferred by a solemn act of consecration duly administered on a person or persons, with the title of bishop or its equivalent attached and all ordinations of persons as ministers of the word and sacraments, shall be by a bishop and three ministers, at least and that liturgical and non-liturgical forms of worship, the use of the Book of Common Prayer and additional forms of worship, be sanctioned by authority.

These are fundamentals, and leading ministers in the Congregational, Presbyterian and the Episcopal Church in the United States have, in informal conferences, agreed to them.

Movements that are helping to give expression to Christian Unity are—The Christian Unity Foundation, an incorporated body established by a group of ministers and members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Its purpose is to "Promote Christian Unity at home and throughout the world." To this end, to gather and disseminate accurate information relative to the faith and works of all Christian bodies; to set forth the great danger of our unhappy divisions and the waste of spiritual energy due thereto. To devise and suggest practical methods of coöperation and to substitute comity for rivalry and

the propagation of a common faith, as well as to bring together those who are laboring in the same field in the belief that full knowledge of one another will emphasize our actual membership in the one body of Christ and our common agreement in the essentials of faith.

The Christian Unity Foundation has held a number of private, informal conferences in various centers throughout the land and is distributing valuable literature. Copies of their literature can be secured by addressing Rev. Dr. Lowndes, secretary, 143 E. 37th Street, New York City.

The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church appointed in 1910 a Joint Commission to arrange for a world conference on faith and order. Practically all the leading denominations in the United States and recently the churches in Great Britain and Ireland, have appointed representatives to confer with this joint commission.

The plan of the Joint Commission is to gather Christians together in small groups, all over the world, as preparatory to the world conference; an advisory committee has been constituted, composed of one representative of each of the various commissions already appointed to coöperate with the executive committee of the Episcopal Commission in promoting any preparation preliminary to the work of convening the world conference. This commission states that while organic union is the ideal which all Christians should have in their thoughts and prayers, yet the business of the commission is not to force any particular scheme of unity but to promote the holding of a world conference, at which there shall be conferences, not only on points of difference and agreement between Christians but of the values of the various approximations of belief characteristic of the several churches.

Evidently the subject of fellowship and union is a burning question the world over. "The Kikuyu communion" administered by the Anglican Bishop of Mombasa, in Africa, at the close of an interdenominational Missionary conference has stirred the Christian churches not only in that faroff region but

also of Great Britain and the Protestant Episcopal churches of America. It is evident that the spirit of unity is opening the eyes of many to the original, historical position of the Church of England and to the recognition of the truth that the ordination of Christian ministers of all denominations must be recognized, notwithstanding the high churchly notions of some regarding the historic episcopate.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ is the most notable example of federation, at the top. It gives promise of large things. It is creating an *atmosphere* of faith and love through united Christian service, which manifests the spirit of Christian unity and, in the future may increasingly manifest the form of Christian Unity.

The Home Missions Council and the Foreign Missions Council are also splendid manifestations of the spirit of unity which is accomplishing definite results.

Federation at the bottom is illustrated in such organizations as the Chicago Coöperative Council of City Missions, representing the Missionary secretaries, etc., of the Home Mission and Church Extension Societies of the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational and Disciples Church. No congregation of any one of these bodies can be located or established without the advice of this council; and in many places in our land, federated or community congregations are developing, where the ministers and the members remain in official relation, if they desire, to their own denominations but unite in a local congregation to do the work in the community.

A brief statement ought to be made of the Council of the Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System. This is a body united together in "Articles of Agreement" which have been officially approved by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, The Presbyterian Church in the United States, the United Presbyterian Church the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of the South, the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Church in America and the Reformed Church in the United States.

The Council is an advisory body of limited powers and held its Fourth Biennial Convention, March 17-18, 1914, in Philadelphia. At this meeting there was a remarkable discussion of closer relations between this family group of denominations. It was maintained that there was organic unity between these bodies and that it can be manifested more fully either by federation or by consolidation. It was felt that the subject of church union and unity between these bodies required the most careful consideration in order to prevent hap-hazard efforts and to secure the best results, free from prejudice and injury to any one body. As the outcome of the discussion on this subject the following action was taken:

“WHEREAS, There has been a widespread awakening of the spirit of fellowship and coöperation between the Evangelical Churches of our country, in which the Churches of the Presbyterian family have taken a notable part; and

“WHEREAS, The Articles of Agreement adopted by the constituent Churches of this Council, specifically refer to their coöperative work, as one of the reasons for the existence of this Council; and

“WHEREAS, Article V of the said Articles of Agreement reads:

“‘5. The Council shall promote the coöperation of the constituent Churches in their Foreign Missionary work, and also in their general work in the United States of America, in connection with Home Missions. Work among the Colored People, Church Erection, Sabbath Schools, Publication and Education. The Council may also advise and recommend in other matters pertaining to the welfare of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ.’

“Therefore, Be it Resolved: (1) That the Council hereby overtures the Supreme Judicatories of the constituent Churches that they authorize and direct the Council:

“a. To give careful and full attention to the whole subject of ‘Closer relations and more effective administrative coöperation,’ between the several Presbyterian and Reformed

Churches represented in the Council, and with particular reference to the formation of an effective federation of their plans, work and executive or administrative agencies both in the Home and Foreign field.

“b. That the Council shall report its conclusions to the Supreme Judicatories at their meetings in May and June, 1916, and further be it *Resolved*:

“(2) That when as many as four of the Supreme Judicatories shall approve the above overture the Executive Committee of the Council shall appoint a committee of members of the Council, not exceeding eleven in number, which committee shall undertake the duties provided for in the overture, shall confer with the Boards and agencies interested in coöperative work, and shall report to the Council at its next meeting, either special or regular.”

Federated unity possesses many advantages. It recognizes the two principles of progress—differentiation and coherence. It recognizes that the Kingdom of God does not mean exclusiveness on the one hand, or uniform consolidation on the other. It is genuine coöperation without regard to the ultimate result of the coöperative bodies. It is not an effort to get men to think alike or to think together. It is rather an army, composed of various regiments, with differing uniforms, with differing banners, but moving together, facing the same way and fighting the common foe. It is diversity in unity. But in the case of our own land and in the face of the 176 denominations, a growth from 143 in 1890, representing 18 family groups, in addition to 30 or 40 odd, separate or distinct bodies, it would seem that federal unity, to succeed, must hasten the operation of organic unity between the families of churches. Thirty-seven bodies contain more than 95 per cent. of all communicants or 33,580,000, leaving only 1,665,000 for all the remaining 133 bodies.

There are 16 branches of Methodists, 15 branches of Baptists, 23 Lutheran, 12 Presbyterian organizations and 4 Reformed, which are separate and independent and yet essentially

agree, 11 kinds of Mennonites, 4 kinds of Dunkards, 2 kinds of Disciples, 4 kinds of Plymouth Brethren, 6 kinds of Adventists, and not even one of any of the great denominations can be considered a nation-wide church because not one has congregations from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Maine to Texas, while practically all of these numerous denominations are provincial bodies, a large majority of whose members are located in certain sections and yet having the balance of its membership scattered over an immense area, isolated congregations sometimes being thousands of miles from the center of their denomination.

Here is found both weakness on the part of the individual denomination and inefficiency in the development of federal unity.

Facts and sound arguments must convince us that the "Reunion of Christendom" is the *goal* and the organic union of families of churches the immediate *object*.

There are two kinds of unity. One the unity inward; to be believed in,—the other, the manifested unity of the inward unity, to be sought for. The manifestation of unity is the duty of Christ's disciples. Christ's agonizing prayer was: "That they all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that thou didst send me. I in thee, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one."

The burden of our Lord's prayer was for the accomplishment of the will of God and for the fruit of His own sacrifice in the establishment of unity and in its manifestation among His disciples. It was both an inward and a manifested unity for which Christ prayed. There is a unity to be believed in as well as a unity to be exhibited to the world. We cannot make unity but we are to make it manifest. Extraordinary results are promised from this manifestation of unity.

There is unity, but the world cannot see it.

There is unity but the world does not believe it.

It is not necessary to contrast unity and union as though a choice had to be made between them. The spirit of God makes unity. Man makes union. Therefore, there may be union without unity. Nevertheless, unity can be shown to the world only through union. We do have an existing unity—the one, invisible church is the soul which unites the divided visible churches. All true believers are members of the mystical body of Christ:

“The saints in Heaven and on earth
But one communion make;
All join in Christ, their living Head,
And of His grace partake.”

and there is a certain outward union.

Christians differ in dogmas and in theology but agree in articles of faith which are necessary to salvation. They are divided in church government and discipline but all acknowledge and obey Christ as the Head of the Church. They differ widely in modes of worship, rites and ceremonies but they worship the same God, manifested in Christ. They believe that Christ ordained two Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They say the one Lord's Prayer and recite the one Apostolic Creed. They sing the same classical hymns, whether written by Catholic or Protestant, Greek, Lutheran, Reformed, Methodist, Episcopalian or Baptist, and more and more there is a unity of Christian scholarship of all creeds which aims at the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The same *Te Deum*, which in its nature is a confession of faith, is sung by them all.

And there is an ethical unity of Christendom, for all accept the ten commandments and theoretically profess the law of supreme love to God and love to our neighbor and look to the teaching and example of our Saviour as the best model for universal imitation. Finally Christians have not only the same hope of heaven but the hope of the same heaven.

But grant that the hand of Providence is in the present divisions of Christendom and that there is a great difference

between denominationalism and sectarianism. Grant that variety has been developed; certainly too much of it. Grant that the provincial mind has its rights and its advantages and that even Christianity, itself, was brought into the world a provincial faith, nevertheless, it is our duty to work for manifested unity and union. The tree must claim the branches because the branches claim the tree. The life of the tree and of the branches is so closely one life that the branches ultimately cannot remain a part of the tree unless it recognizes its life-giving relationship to the tree and the other branches. Union does not mean uniformity, but variety in manifested unity like the variety of states, counties, cities and of races and individuals; in the manifested unity of the life of the nation.

Professor Edward Scribner Ames, in his book, *The Psychology of Religious Experience* has an interesting chapter on the "Psychology of the Religious Sects," in which he says the different religious bodies are in effect so many social clans. "Their loyalties, antipathies and methods are based upon race and class inheritances and prejudices, merged with the fine idealism of the central Christian faith. Under the influence of modern life, these clans feel drawn or driven together for mutual defense, but they are suspicious and awkward in actual attempts at union. While theoretically admitting that the things in which they agree are more numerous and more vital than those in which they differ, yet they continue, under the influence of deep-seated instincts and habits to magnify incidental differences. They are under the control of the ancient biological, primitive clan impulse to preserve the identity and integrity of the organism. . . . The conflict, however, which is coming to consciousness in modern society is no longer between clan and clan or between the clan and complete social detachment, but rather a conflict between the lesser and the larger social whole. . . . The various denominations possess genuine social consciousness. That is their strength but that consciousness is too much restricted both in outlook and in methods. What is now demanded by the spirit of the age is that they

shall overcome their partial and limited historical functions and participate more fully and with scientific awareness and efficiency in the highest ideals for the whole race."

The union of families of churches at the present time is desirable and necessary if we admit the arguments as to the unity of the church and our duty to manifest this unity to the world, in order to fulfil the Saviour's prayer and work.

Nine points are suggested briefly without entering into any adequate discussion:

1. The difficulties and the urgency of the work at home and abroad demand the most powerful and effective use of our resources and this cannot be done without the union of families of churches. We have to evangelize a thousand millions of our fellow-creatures, under the most difficult circumstances, at best; using differing languages, and amid trying climatic conditions. Two thirds of the human race to be evangelized and placed under the reforming influence of the word of truth, and what is being done by the churches in this land for foreign missions is vastly inadequate because of the expense of administration, loose organization, waste of resources, both of men and of money, and thousands of ministers and churches struggling for a bare existence rather than giving service to the Lord. The evangelization of the home land and Christian education is complicated beyond measure because of our divisions. Proof of this is seen in the fact that the Protestant churches of the United States have not met the situation as well as the Protestant Churches of our neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, in the last twenty-five years, and largely because Canada has had fewer denominations. The urban population of our country in 1910 was 42 millions; in 1890, 22 millions, while the rural population in 1910 equalled 49 millions, as over against 40 millions in 1890, which indicates that 46.3 per cent. of the population of the land is in our cities to-day, while 53.7 is in rural districts, whereas in 1890 63.9 per cent. were in the rural districts and only 36.1 per cent. urban population. In the same period of time, towns or places having 2,500 in the rural districts increased from 6,466 in 1890 to 11,784 in 1910.

This massing of population in the cities raises numerous problems in the facing of which our divided Protestantism is marking time if not losing ground, and the rural problem is no less complicated. Wherever you go you will find either overlapping or over-looking. Recently the writer spoke at a United Home Missionary service in a town of seven hundred, less than 200 miles from Philadelphia, where there are five Protestant churches, the Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Reformed and United Presbyterian, and three of the five, if not all five, receive help from their church bodies to maintain ministers at a starvation salary, with the people being starved and the community interests being neglected. This is not an isolated case as we all know.

2. The attitude of our Jewish, Roman Catholic and atheistic elements, require the getting together of our churches in federation and of families in union. One out of every five people in New York City is a member of the Jewish race. Aggressive hostility is shown against even the atmosphere of religious influence on Christian character in our public schools, and this is making serious inroads in the teaching of Christian ethics to the children of the land.

We can rejoice in the splendid work of the Roman Catholic Church, which it is doing in this country, and yet we cannot close our eyes to the situation that the Roman Church is endeavoring in this land, as of old in other lands, to exercise an undue influence in the affairs of government, whether it be the nation, the state or the city. At the same time the writer is one of those who believe that our Roman Catholic friends will rejoice to see the day when there are fewer Protestant denominations and when a small group, representing for the present, necessary types and forms of variety of families of churches, are united in the Federal Council.

A Roman Catholic periodical recently summoned Roman Catholics and Protestants to cease criticising each other, to coöperate practically and put up a combined defense against the atheism, socialism and anarchism of the day—an effective

combination of all the Christian forces against anti-Christian forces working against us. The pressure and spirit of the times demands coöperation and combination.

3. The elementary needs of non-Christian people call for what is fundamental and essential in Christianity. *Impurity, inequality and hopeless indifference* are the great evils of the world. The remedy is in the character of God, the love of God and His life and not in any of the points in which we are at variance. The world needs to know the Fatherhood of God in order to actualize the brotherhood of man.

4. We are already agreed in the evangelical churches in this country on the intellectual basis that is necessary for the union of families of churches and unity abroad. We believe in one God and Father of us all and in one Lord Jesus Christ and in one Holy Spirit and in one Bible and in one faith and in one salvation. There is agreement in the spiritual principle underlying symbols and outward forms, and this is the fundamental and essential thing. The time ought not therefore to be far distant when, in any united church, including all the Methodist or including all the Presbyterian and Reformed, etc., there will be room made for some disagreement as to symbols and institutional forms. Perhaps the saying of the old Puritan expresses the truth, after all, when he said: "There are only two types of mind among men; the Roundhead and the Cavalier. The Roundhead is a man who bases all faith on experience. To him, outward authority means very little and he is the natural non-conformist. The Cavalier is a man who glories in outward form and ceremony. To him, authority is final and he suspects experience because the human spirit makes more errors than reaches truths." If our scheme of union takes into account these contrasted types of mind and makes room for them, union may not be so far distant as some image. The twentieth century has little use for metaphysical puzzles. You remember the Scotchman who got to arguing on some of the questions of theology. There was a taciturn neighbor sitting at their table, smoking his pipe. The disputants got so excited

they waked up a dog lying at their feet. He rushed out and began to bark vociferously, whereat the silent neighbor said: "Keep still, you brute. You do not know any more about it than they do."

The simplicities of the Gospel are the vital things. Ask a good man who is going to church and trying to love his neighbor and serve Jesus Christ, how to define the Atonement, the Inspiration of the Bible and to separate one theory from another. He would be floored immediately. These distinctions do not enter into his mind from one year's end to another unless we put them there. Our modern life demands the fundamentals of the Gospel and on these we are agreed.

5. The simplicity of the missionary and evangelistic aim invites unity and indicates how indispensable unity is. The aim of missionary activity abroad is the naturalization of Christianity in the national life of the different non-Christian peoples. It is not the extension there of any particular view of Christian truth or any particular form of Christian organization. There ought to be one church of Christ in China, Japan and Africa and in all the missionary lands and in our own land. If we recall our history what are we doing but perpetuating certain national types which took their form and shape in other lands, an Italian Christianity from Italy, Lutheranism and Reformed Church from Germany and Holland, Anglicanism from England, Presbyterianism from Scotland. Bishop Anderson has well said: "Our religion is a heterogeneous conglomeration of imported traditions." "Every kind of church can be found here. Here are all the elements of ecumenity. Here they are side by side, yet they know not one another. Is there nothing to look forward to except the permanent establishment of foreign types on American soil?"

Surely the simplicity of evangelism and social service indicates the way of deliverance.

6. Visible unity is an economic necessity. We realize that the economical argument might be easily over-worked. Never-

theless the economic argument has weight because divisions are proving to be as economically unsound as they are theologically unsafe. Hard facts are demonstrating that Christ's doctrine of unity is the sure, workable doctrine, in this practical, workaday world. The churches cannot do the work of the church. We know that in the missionary situation abroad. If St. Paul revolutionized the community with one church and with one creed ought it not be enough for us to take to Asia and Africa, the same religion he took to Europe? The fact is, that our Christian colleges abroad are representatives of all the denominations. The missionary propaganda at every point is minimizing or consolidating ecclesiastical differences. Are they wrong in doing this or are we wrong in maintaining diverse organizations whose differences our representatives have to conceal in the interests of a truer Christianity?

The economic argument applied to the question of ministerial support, the scarcity of ministers, the multiplication and maintenance of colleges and theological seminaries, of administrative boards, of thousands upon thousands of churches struggling for a bare existence, the inability to secure proper divisions of work, in accordance with the differing talents of men, the need of men to enter the ministry, gifted as great preachers, as great administrators, executives or leaders, is shown, but divided Protestantism makes impossible proper divisions of labor and assignment of such activities to which men are naturally fitted and inclined, and if many communities are over-churched, others are under-churched.

In some sections this is true because, unable to support five or ten churches, they will have none and it applies to country districts as well as large cities. We know that our Home Missions Council provides a sort of gentlemen's agreement by which it is sought to avoid overlapping. This is good but it is practically ineffective and does not offer a justifying reason why these denominations which are scarcely distinguishable from each other, should not adopt some plan of union. It is better to unite than to perpetuate a narrow Christianity.

7. Visible unity is a necessity from the standpoint of social efficiency. Can a sectarian Christianity mould the social conscience? Can it act continentally? Does it not emphasize individualism as over against organized Christianity? Of course, the vocation of the Church is to convert individual men to Christ but it is more than that. The social message of Jesus teaches us that we are to bring about the new earth in which the Gospel and the Church are to be the agents of God's kingdom. The Church is more than the aggregate of its churches or of its individuals. Life is an organism. The church is an organism. Regenerated individuals and a reformed society is the gospel for this world. The world is organized, labor is organized, society is organized, politics is organized, the nations of the world are organizing internationally. Everything is organized except the Christian religion, and Christ prayed that his people would be organized. A dis-united, disjointed, individualistic Christianity, where every church and every man is an independent unit, cannot stand up against the highly organized conditions of to-day. The democracy of the times demands a democracy of the Church. The call for a common policy or a united utterance, a united service must be the call of great bodies of Christians united in groups and these groups united together in a great federation.

A practical illustration of the evils of our denominationalism is seen in the fact that when men are required to do something in the name of God and humanity, for the city or nation, they feel compelled to make it a non-church and non-religious enterprise. The Gospel of Christ supplies the spiritual conviction and gives the vision but when the conviction takes concrete shape it somehow seems to have to divorce itself from the source of its inspiration and so the church sees settlements, leagues, associations, organizations doing the work of Christ and philanthropy and social service in great cities but forced to do so on a non-religious or undenominational, non-church, basis. Thus its ideals and spiritual power are lost and the influences that God will have joined together are being forced apart through divisions of His church.

Reforms without religion, may be a mere whitewash of the surface. Society needs regeneration, not simply reformation; good men and women united together as well as good laws.

8. The increasing unity of family groups of churches is necessary to give organic expression to the religious life of the nation. The Catholic church is world-wide but just because it is Catholic it is also national in tone and temper. Ours is a Christian nation, yet who would define what American Christianity is? We have twenty millions or more of Protestant communicants, but has the United States a Christianity that is distinctly her own? Our country gathers her people from the four quarters of the globe and in the melting pot of our public school system and political methods, she makes good Americans of them. Order is brought out of chaos and is it impossible for the great families of Protestantism in this land to unite and bring into being *national* churches and finally *one national church*?

9. We must come back in argument on this subject to the emphasis of the unity for which our Lord prayed. He did not pray that they all may be one as John or James are one or as brethren are one, but that they all may be one as "thou and I are one." The kind of unity for which he prayed was not a unity of fraternity; not a unity of federal relationship of people externally bound to one another. The ideal that he held out was not the ideal of the unity of human brotherhood but the ideal of the unity of a Godhead itself.

The church united will be the church glorified. "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them that they may be one even as we are one." Is not the Church's glory dim to-day and cannot it all be traced back to the divisions among us as the cause? The great apostle classed divisions with drunkenness and fornication. Whether we feel the shame of our divisions or not, our enemies exult in them. If the word of our Lord is true, that unity of the Church would make the world believe on Him, then we cannot believe that the divisions of the Church into rival denominations have stimulated Christian effort.

What our Lord prayed against cannot be permanently profitable to the Church. Dr. Schaff has well said:

“The apostles who thus far have most influenced the course of Church History are Peter and Paul. The apostle whose spirit will preside over the final consummation, is John, the bosom friend of Jesus, the Apostle of Love.”

This agrees with the statement of Meyer, the great commentator, who, by a lifelong study of the word of God, gradually arose from a rationalistic to an almost orthodox standpoint when he said, as quoted by Dr. Schaff, in the Schaff-Lange Commentary on John:

“The wonderful gospel of John, in its fulness of grace, truth, peace, light and life, is destined to contribute to a closer union of Christians.”

Can we not believe that the twentieth century is emphasizing anew the greatest truth of all, that God is love and that we must love one another as he has loved us? Dr. Philip Schaff spoke a prophetic and true word when he said: “Before the reunion of Christendom can be accomplished we must expect providential events, new Pentecosts, new reformations—as great as any that have gone before. The twentieth century has marvelous surprises in store for the church and the world which may surpass even those of the nineteenth. History now moves with telegraphic speed and may accomplish the work of years in a single day.” Families of churches even now are coming together and all the leading Protestant denominations are in federation on the principle—“In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity.”

Finally, let us not forget there is perhaps no other one object in the world for which as large a volume of prayer is arising to-day all over the nation, as for this one thing—the unity of Christendom in its representation of Christ to the non-Christian world. Let us take to heart the noble appeal to prayer, thoroughly representative of scores, published twelve years ago in Japan by two of the Bishops of the Anglican Church. It is well to close with it because of its illustration of

unity and because of its appeal to us to-day. Bishop Foss and Bishop Awdry called us to

“‘Penitence’ for any wilfulness, prejudice, worldiness or evil temper in ourselves or our predecessors which may have helped to bring about a condition of Christendom so different from that for which our Lord prayed.

“Prayer for such change and enlightenment of our own hearts as may help toward the undoing of this great evil—for the graces of wisdom, humility, sincerity, unworldiness, self-control and open mind, reverence for others who sincerely disagree with us, complete subordination of our self-will to the will of God, a firm hold on truth, a spiritual mind—in short the mind which was in Christ Jesus.

“Prayer for the removal of obstacles—in, the character of professing Christians, in heredity and other prejudice, in narrowness of views, in special shibboleths, in unworthy rivalries, in exaggerated attachment to non-essentials.

“Prayer for a fuller outpouring of the Holy Spirit in His various powers, and for a more ready recognition of the work of the Spirit in others in whom the ‘Fruits of the Spirit’ are apparent.

“Thanksgiving for the growing sense of sin in regard to our division, and of longing for unity; and for the better hope which this gives of the world being won to believe in the mission of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In view of all these historical statements and the overpowering facts relating to the Christian Church and the world movements of the day, may we express the hope that the Reformed Church—irenic and mediatorial in its origin and history since the sixteenth century, and the bodies having the Reformed faith and the Presbyterian system, known in the United States as churches of the open mind, and liberal hand to all good causes, and a ministry and membership representing in training, intelligence and activity, the best products of our American life with a form of church government in har-

mony with the political institutions of nation and state;—a church which has given Philip Schaff, the pioneer and prophet of Christian Unity, may this church lead in movements towards the coöperation, consolidation and comprehensiveness of the Church of Christ.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE MEANING OF EVOLUTION. By Samuel Christian Schmucker, Ph.D.
66 Fifth Ave., New York, The Macmillan Company. 1913. Pp. 298.
Price \$1.50 net.

There are many text-books on evolution written in the vernacular of pure science which are unintelligible to the average layman. Here is a volume that interprets evolution in simple terms. Even those can understand it who have never gazed through a microscope. Its style is lucid and the cryptic terminology of the biological laboratory is reduced to a minimum. Ordinary intelligence will enable any reader to follow the author's argument and to appreciate the strength of his conclusions.

The scientist will value the book for its concise treatment of the historical data of evolution, for its accurate statement of various theories of evolution, and for its many original observations illustrating the general process of ascending life. The theologian will appreciate the fact that modern biology, as here interpreted, lends no support to materialism. The intelligent layman will see that science and theology are not at war. A man may be a staunch believer in the Christian religion and at the same time accept the fact of evolution. And one may be a convinced evolutionist without losing faith in God.

To Dr. Schmucker evolution is the name which science gives to the method of creation. He makes it clear that the fact of evolution is no longer in dispute among competent scientists, but he makes it equally clear that the manner of evolution is still an open question. Darwin's theory of Natural Selection has been modified by later scientists. When a modern biologist speaks of the death of Darwinism he by no means declares the bankruptcy of evolution, he simply means that natural selection is not sufficient to explain the process of evolution. Pending the outcome of the scientific controversy concerning the method of evolution the author amply confirms the convictions of many men that the ultimate conclusion will not subvert the Christian faith.

The book forms a valuable contribution to apologetics. Though a professor of science by vocation the author also knows philosophy and theology. And, what is more to the point, he thoroughly understands the essence of the Christian religion. He blends these various interests into a consistent and inspiring view of the relation of matter and spirit. He finds God at work in His world,

evolution notwithstanding. His book may be strongly recommended to those who still fear that evolution renders God superfluous to men and reduces the universe to a mechanism without rational foundation and purposive direction.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE COUNTRY CHURCH. By Chas. O. Gill and Gifford Pinchot. 66 Fifth Ave., New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. xii + 222. Price \$1.25 net.

This book owes its inception to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It is published under its authority and it presents a striking example of the literary work that may be expected of this important organization. The chief aim of the Federal Council is to make the American Church effective through coöperation. In this volume two members of its Commission on the Church and Country Life present a large array of facts which prove the decline of the Country Church. The authors selected two representative counties in our eastern states, one in Vermont and the other in New York, for a careful study of the actual conditions of the religious life in rural communities. Thus they ascertained the comparative statistics concerning the religious life of a population of fifty thousand persons during a period of twenty years. With little explanation they let these facts speak for themselves in a series of tables and diagrams. And the summary of results shows that in these Counties the Country Church has suffered a decline which proves beyond question that it is losing its hold on the community.

The authors base no hasty generalizations on the specific results of their original study of the religious life in two counties. But there is ample reason to conclude that the conditions prevailing in these two representative counties are typical of large areas of our rural life both East and West. Their findings therefore make sober and serious reading for those who appreciate the vital relation of our rural population to the purity and integrity of our national life. If religion declines in the Country Church our Christian civilization is bound to decay.

This book however does not end with despair. In addition to its searching diagnosis of a perilous malady it also contains a section on remedies. It offers no quack cure, but it suggests and recommends a number of sane, practical measures and methods of relief. It will perform a great mission if it inspires the Church of Christ in America to devote no less zeal to its city problems but more of its best thought and strength to the crying needs of the Country Church.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE MAKING OF TO-MORROW. By Shailer Mathews. New York, Eaton & Mains. Pp. 193. Price \$1.00 net.

One of our great modern tasks is the interpretation of democracy in terms of religion. We are coming to see that our American democracy is still a very unfinished product of human civilization. But, though raw and crude in many phases, it is also rich in promise. And it is in the making. There are many forces at work that will fulfill its promises.

Would there were more editorial writers in our land who have eyes to see that clearly and language to say it trenchantly and pithily, as does Professor Mathews in this little volume. It is a collection of chapters which appeared originally as editorials in the *World To-Day*. They deal with various phases of the industrial, political, and social life. But one common purpose binds all the fragments into a consistent whole. The author sees and exhibits God's working in the social evolution. He reads the signs of the times with a clear eye and he interprets them with an optimistic faith as pointing towards an extension and glorification of democracy. His book has the tonic quality and it is heartily recommended to all who are helpers in the Making of To-Morrow.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. By Moses Battenwieser, Ph.D.. 66 Fifth Ave., New York, The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxii + 347. Price \$2.00.

This book is from the pen of the Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. It deals with the faith and the message of the prophets of Israel from the eighth to the fifth century. The author fully accepts the historico-critical method of modern research. He maintains however that hitherto research in the field of literary prophecy has concentrated its attention on the historical side of the problem and neglected to a large extent the more vital side of the movement, the spiritual side. His primary aim therefore is an exposition of the personal faith of the prophets. In carrying out this purpose the author departs from the chronological order of presentation. He starts his study of the personal religion of the prophets at the point of its highest development, in the fervid record which Jeremiah has left of his inner life; and then he takes up mainly Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and Deutero-Isaiah in a descending order of excellence.

The general reader will find the first and last chapters most readable. They set forth the faith and the messages of the great literary prophets of Israel. They are a summary of the results of the scholarly labor of the author in a striking and popular form. The key note of the personal religion of the prophets was, "Not

by virtue of material strength and political power shall ye prevail, but by my spirit, saith the Lord." And that profound religious experience received various intellectual expressions in the messages of the successive prophets. These chapters form a contribution to the literature on prophetism. They prove that both in spirit and teaching the great prophets of Israel were the lineal and spiritual ancestors of Jesus Christ. They tower far above all the contemporary non-Israelitish teachers of religion and morality, and they take us easily to the very threshold of the New Testament.

The intervening chapters are primarily intended for the specialist. They contain the scientific processes which underlie the practical conclusions of the author. Here the reader will find views that are at variance with those held by other Old Testament scholars. They are presented clearly and commandingly, and yet with the modesty and reserve characteristic of all true scholarship, "Not without the hope that the studies incorporated therein may on some points open up new lines of thought and throw a new light on certain vital questions connected with Israelitish prophecy." The readers of this volume will look forward with pleasant anticipations to a second volume, giving a more detailed exposition of the religious views of the prophets, which the author has promised.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE FAITH OF JAPAN. By Tasuku Harada, LL.D. 66 Fifth Ave., New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. ix + 190. Price \$1.25.

At one bound almost Japan has leaped to a permanent place among the leading nations of the world. Opportunity played a part in this sudden ascent of an Asiatic people, but it does not fully account for it. The reason for it must be sought in the forces that shaped the soul of Japan during the long ages of her hermit life. One of these moulding forces was religion.

The volume under review contains an authoritative account of the faith of Japan. The author is a Christian scholar and holds the position of President of Doshisha University at Kyoto. His book consists of a course of lectures delivered at Hartford Theological Seminary in the fall of 1910 on the Lamson foundation. They amply deserve the wider publicity assured for them in book form.

By the Faith of Japan the author does not mean Shintoism, Confucianism, Buddhism, or Christianity, all of which form elements of the religious life of the nation, but "that union of elements from each and all that have taken root in Japanese soil and moulded the thought and life of her people." The book falls into eight chapters which contain, respectively, An Historical Sketch, The Conception of Deity, The Way of Humanity, The Law of

Enlightenment, The Doctrine of Salvation, The Spirit of Loyalty, The Idea of Future Life, and the Faith: Old and New. They are admirably written and carefully indexed. The reviewer knows no book that, in brief compass, gives one a better conception of the elemental beliefs that have been the constructive principles in the life of a great people.

The book forms an illuminating contribution to the young science of Comparative Religion. As a native Japanese, thoroughly conversant with the faith of his people, Dr. Harada has given us a trustworthy report of it. And as an intelligent Christian he can make sympathetic and yet discriminating comparisons between the old and the new faiths that are struggling in Japan. In this little volume the historical student of religion finds three great systems of religion existing side by side through many centuries. He observes the emergence of a working faith that is an amalgam of the indigenous religion of Shinto, with Confucian ethics and with Buddhist doctrine. He sees that ancient faith tested and tried by the influx of western religion, science, literature, art, and industry. There has been no opportunity to witness a similar spectacle since the decline of the Roman empire. And the outcome of this modern conflict of religions in Japan is no less momentous for Asia than was that of the early centuries of our Christian era for Europe.

The book is also profoundly interesting from the missionary standpoint. One cannot wish for a saner and clearer presentation of the missionary problem in Japan than is here given. The opposition that Christianity encounters in Japan is traced to its causes. They constitute barriers that are very formidable. The author calls the internal forces arrayed against Christianity "gigantic." Yet he believes that Christianity is steadily gaining in strength and efficiency. But the western Church must realize that the Christianization of Japan is no holiday task but a stupendous enterprise.

This book is sure of a welcome. It will be eagerly read by many students of comparative religion and it may be profitably studied in missionary classes.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

CAN WE STILL BE CHRISTIANS? By Rudolf Eucken. 66 Fifth Ave., New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. vi + 218. Price \$1.25.

This is a translation of the latest book of the celebrated Jena professor, who now commands a world-wide hearing. It is no less difficult to understand than the other writings of Professor Eucken in spite of the lucid English of the translation. But it amply repays the labor of concentrated study. The student who grasps the thought of this volume will understand the universal vogue of the master and the enthusiastic devotion of his numerous dis-

ciples. And the Christian student will realize that, while the Church has no more candid critic than Professor Eucken, he is at the same time a most sympathetic friend and interpreter of Christianity.

The title of this recent publication sounds almost sensational, but sensationalism forms no part of its rich contents. In the body of the book we have three main divisions devoted, respectively, to The Justification of the Question, The Foundation of the Answer, and The Development of the Answer. Here the argument is carried step by step to its conclusion. It is closely reasoned and carefully supported by many observations from past history and from modern life.

What then is his conclusion? Can we still be Christians? Professor Eucken answers this somewhat startling question emphatically in the affirmative. He says: "Our answer is that we not only can, but must be Christians." However there follows an equally emphatic proviso. The one indispensable condition is "that Christianity be recognized as a progressive historical movement still in the making, that it be shaken free from the numbing influence of ecclesiasticism and placed upon a broader foundation." This answer in both of its parts will find an intelligent reception in wide sections of the Church. Modern Protestantism thoroughly agrees with the author that the future welfare of mankind depends upon the fate of the Christian religion. More than ever to-day we must be Christians, if our life is to have meaning and value. And we must be able to convince our age, steeped in materialism and distracted by skepticism, that Christianity alone can enrich life at its very center and thus restore joy and strength and hope to it. But in order to accomplish this mission in modern life Christianity must be placed on a broader foundation. Its essence must be distinguished from its many accretions. The central fact of Christianity according to Professor Eucken is not the reconciliation of a lost world to God, but the realization of a new type of humanity whose head is Jesus Christ.

The well known philosophical position of the author may not commend itself to all readers and much of his detailed criticism of the Church and of the doctrine of the Church may challenge debate and dissent. But the trend of the book as a whole is altogether admirable. Linked with a sympathetic insight into the historical essence of our Christian religion, we find also a keen appreciation of the momentous issues confronting the Church in the modern world and a constructive program of re-adjustment that deserves the careful attention of all who are laboring to make Christianity the vital and commanding force of the Twentieth Century.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

TELEPATHY OF THE CELESTIAL WORLD. By Horace C. Stanton, D.D., LL.D.
New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. xxx + 471.
Price \$2.00 net.

This book makes large claims in the discussion of a subject which from different directions and various points of view, often presents itself to thoughtful minds. It can hardly be said that the large claims are met and satisfied by a scientific explanation of the phenomena brought under discussion by the author. But the book is interesting for at least two reasons: It suggests lines of thought as to the modes of communication between mind and mind, "whether in the body or out of the body," which may lead to fruitful results in proportion as the scattered phenomena of thought transference come to be better understood and scientifically organized; and it brings together a great many facts, or reported facts, from the proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research and other sources more or less authenticated, including thought transference, visions, presentiments, apparitions, etc., which furnish material for analysis and ingenious speculation to the psychologist as well as to the general reader.

The author assumes that telepathy, "the impressing of one mind by another mind, or the obtaining of impressions by one mind from another mind, otherwise than through the recognized media of sense," is a scientifically established fact. Although in this life, the power of making or receiving impressions in this way is but imperfectly developed, it is a real power, always present, but capable at times of stronger manifestation according to the changing condition of the agents; and the activity is such as to warrant the belief that in the future life it will be the recognized form of communication between spirit and spirit, directly and instantaneously throughout the illimitable universe. As the phenomena of physical communication depend upon the subtle presence of an all-pervading ether, so the phenomena of spiritual intercourse, of mind with mind, depend upon the activity of the omnipresent mind of God.

These are large assumptions. In the first place it is not at all certain that in ordinary cases of telepathy the communication, whatever it may be, proceeds immediately from mind to mind. As in the case of so-called subjective sensations the brain centres corresponding to ordinary sensations are supposed to be stimulated, so here the brain centres may also be involved. Only the stimulation is supposed to be from within instead of from without. Telepathy, in fact, is only a word by which we hide our ignorance of the *modus operandi*; as when we say a man is born blind because he comes into the world without the power of sight. In the second place, we know nothing at all of *pure spirit*, what it is or how it works. We speak of it in negative terms; it is not matter, it does not operate according to the laws of physical interaction,

the phenomena of mind in the two orders of existence, therefore, are not necessarily analogous or capable of explaining each other.

The author's application of his principle to communications between the divine mind and human minds leads to certain conceptions which, if orthodox, are too mechanical to harmonize with present-day thought. For instance, he asserts that the three persons of the trinity communicate with one another by telepathy, as if they were three personalities standing apart without a common consciousness. So in his theory of inspiration, while he assumes that the biblical writers obtained their facts in the ordinary way, they were telepathically directed what to record and what to omit—a view of inspiration which few thinkers will be disposed to accept.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE BALKANS, A LABORATORY OF HISTORY. By William M. Sloane, Seth Low Professor of History, Columbia University. New York, The Methodist Book Concern. Pp. viii + 322. Price \$1.50 net.

Professor Sloane has written a book on the Balkans which is not only timely and interesting, but also of great permanent value. He was exceptionally well qualified for the task by years of patient study, by residence abroad where he had access to the best authorities, and by his personal presence in Europe during the recent upheaval which enabled him to make a first-hand study of the whole situation. He is a close observer, a clear and vigorous thinker, and a graceful and fluent writer. The book may be safely recommended, therefore, to all who desire a clear insight into the complicated problems connected with the Near Eastern Question.

There is first an illuminating historical sketch of the relation of Turkey to European politics. This is followed by a description of Turkish rule under Abdul Hamid. The author then proceeds to give a full and clear account of the Balkan peoples and the Balkan nations, their social, economic, and religious aspects, their relation to each other and to the six Great Powers of Europe, and the currents and counter-currents of political machinations, schemes, and aspirations which have agitated and disturbed the nations of Europe during the last fifty years. This makes room for a discussion of the Revolution of 1908, the formation of the Balkan Alliance, and the Latest War, its causes, the outcome, and the bearing which it will have upon the future development of the Balkan states, the Slavic propaganda, and the relation between Mohammedanism and Christianity in eastern Europe and western Asia.

We consider it one of the most valuable contributions made in recent times to contemporaneous history.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. Part I. The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels by Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912.

This is a book for the textual critic of the New Testament, and for him only; but for him it is of very great value. In fact, in the present state of knowledge, one who would do thorough work in the textual study of the Gospels can not well do without it. Belonging to the Freer Collection, the Washington Manuscript of the Gospels has been known to scholars only since 1906. It was formerly in the library of the Monastery of Scheurite at Atripe (near Sohag), opposite Akhmine in Egypt. It is a complete codex of the Gospels, written in capitals, and remarkable for giving the Gospels in the Western order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. It is the opinion of those who are competent to pronounce judgment that the manuscript can not be later than the sixth century, and that it is probably as old as the fourth century. This last is the view held by Prof. Sanders; and if correct, the manuscript will rank among the oldest of our New Testament Uncials. Prof. Sanders has put the textual student of the New Testament under lasting obligation by his careful study of this new treasure, and by the great amount of material which he has here put at our disposal.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE MEN OF THE GOSPELS. By Lynn Harold Hough. New York, Eaton and Mains. Pp. 98. Price 50c. net.

This is a book of character sketches of men whose names and works are recorded in the gospels. The author sketches in an interesting manner the characters of John, Peter, Thomas, Judas, Nicodemus, Caiaphas, Pilate, Herod Antipas, the Centurion, and the Rich Young Ruler. The purpose of the author is to present the chief characteristic of the New Testament men under consideration, rather than to describe their life and work in detail. The real worth of the book lies in its strong emphasis on the moral values of the characters described. The style is terse, the contents suggestive and quickening.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE LIFE EFFICIENT. By George A. Miller. New York, Eaton and Mains. Pp. 248. Price \$1.00 net.

This is a series of essays emphasizing the moral and spiritual values of life. They make no claim to exegetical or theological value, but they do deal with the great average life of people. They attempt to interpret daily life in terms of spiritual value. Among the topics discussed are, "The Life that is Strong," "The Fountains of Faith," "The Gospel of the Commonplace." The pages of this book are full of homely, common sense. The

author has a vigorous style. He says thing with a directness which makes them penetrate to the heart. The following quotation from a chapter on "Three Fools" is to the point. In speaking of the man with defective judgment he says: "The man who thinks that he can get something for nothing is usually incurable. Preachers once inoculated with the speculation mania forfeit their high calling for a mess of shares in some company. High officials of the Church of Jesus Christ allow their names to be used on the letter heads of promotion corporations for the purpose of selling stock to the humble investor. Pastors have lost their usefulness and sometimes their characters for some petty promotion project."

H. M. J. KLEIN.

INDIA, MALAYSIA AND THE PHILIPPINES. A Practical Study in Missions. By W. F. Oldham. New York, Eaton and Mains. Pp. 292. Price \$1.00 net.

Most of the lectures in this book were delivered on the Nathan Graves Foundation of Syracuse University. They were prepared for undergraduate hearers. The author, Secretary Oldham, has had a life-long experience with foreign missions and missionaries. He has a first hand acquaintance with the facts he handles. He presents in this book a vivid picture of the conditions that surround the great missionary enterprise of the Christian Church. The first chapter is a presentation of the pros and cons of the missionary question. Then follows a discussion of the missionary and his message. It is a stirring appeal to young people showing the great sphere of usefulness open to earnest men and women in the foreign mission field. Separate chapters are devoted to India, Malaysia and the Philippines. He says that the greatest need in the Philippines is a union Christian College. The wide experience of the author in the fields he describes makes this book intensely interesting and stimulating.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1914.

I.

THE WORLD-VIEW OF MODERN THEISTIC PHILOSOPHY.

E. E. KRESGE.

Modern philosophic conceptions of God have had two distinct sources. One type has had its origin in the philosophy of Spinoza, and has been transmitted, in slightly different forms, through such notables like Herder, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Paulsen and Royce. God, viewed as substance by Spinoza, and as logic by Hegel, is the only ultimate and absolute reality. Nature and man are only differentiated modes of the divine being, and have no substantial existence of their own. We are in the realm of a thoroughgoing monism. This type of God-conception does not concern us directly in this article. These philosophers cannot properly be classified as theists because they deny, in any real sense, the personality of this absolute being whom they call God. This type of thought, however, has profoundly influenced modern theism through its emphasis upon the divine immanence in man and in nature in contrast to the prevailing idea of transcendence, and also through its emphasis of gradual growth and development as the law of the universe in distinction from the idea of a

special creation. The modern ideas of *immanence* and *evolution* we owe largely to the systems that have had their source in Spinoza.

A second type of thought has had its origin in Kant. But, unlike Spinoza, Kant has had three distinct classes of followers. In his *Kritik of Pure Reason* he drew a sharp line of demarcation between the knowable and the unknowable. The understanding is limited to the sensible, while the supersensible, if there is any such thing at all, must remain unknown. In the *Kritik of Practical Reason* he posits God for the sake of morality. Complete good, which is the coördination of virtue and happiness, to which every man is entitled, cannot be realized by us unless we believe with all our might in a good God through whose omniscience and omnipotence this can be thought of as possible. God is posited simply to actualize a concept of the will whose origin and validity by no means depend upon the existence of God. In the third *Kritik* Kant posits God as a principle of judgment that must be assumed for the sake of explaining life and collective nature; but, true to the epistemological limitations set in the first *Kritik*, he denies that we can know that there is such a being as we must assume. In spite of the protests of the serious minded little man, many have passed from the epistemological limitations of the first *Kritik* straight into scepticism. Others, influenced primarily by the second *Kritik*, like Fichte, Jacoby, Ritschl and some modern pragmatists, have transferred God altogether from the realm of the physical to the moral. God is made an object of faith and is interpreted in terms of moral purpose. Still others, like Lotze, have started with Kant's epistemology, but have gone beyond the limits set therein. We can know only phenomena; but this does not mean, according to Lotze, that in knowing phenomena we do not know *reality*, for in the phenomena *reality* is given, for the reality of a thing lies in its activities, not in a quiescent something behind them; and the better we know the activity of the thing, whether the thing be God, or our own souls, or a tree, the more thoroughly we know

the thing itself. Through its sensible manifestations of itself we penetrate to its supersensible source. In this way some knowledge of the supersensible must be granted. Thus Kant has been the father of sceptics, pragmatists and theists.

The object of this paper will be to show the trend of thought of the men who have been influenced, directly or indirectly, by the last two *Kritiken* of Kant, and have felt in addition the force of the idea of the divine immanence realizing itself by an evolutionary process as declared in those systems that have had their source in Spinoza. I will ask the readers of the REVIEW to pardon me for devoting more space to pointing out the methods of the philosopher than to the actual portrayal of his philosophy. I do this because the Weltanschauung of this type of philosophy is more or less familiar to us all, for it agrees essentially with that of modern theology, while the philosophic method may not be so well known. In this philosophy we find the old tenets with which we are all familiar, namely a personal God, who is the creator and governor of the world; a *real* material world, which is the medium of spiritual activity and the means through which spiritual purpose is realized. This type of philosophy believes in the ethical freedom of the individual, and, for practical purposes, admits the immortality of the soul. It is a world that looks very much like the world of our christian faith.

The philosopher, however, goes beyond the task of the theologian. He will not accept these tenets because they are said to be supernaturally revealed to miraculously inspired men, or because some ecclesiastical authority bids him do so. They must approve themselves as true and real, or else cannot be accepted as valid theoretical or practical principles. He will subject them to an impartial criticism. He will ask: are these principles universal or necessary? Can these things be known or determined by any valid process of knowing? Can we apply to them the rigid tests to which we subject all other matters of truth? If this cannot be done, these beliefs can have no place in a philosophical system. The ultimate court

of appeal is reason, either pure or practical. A thing must approve itself to the understanding or the will, or else remain a matter of honest doubt. In the case of some philosophers of this type the theoretic tendency predominates. They will ask: can the thing be known and, therefore, be classed as a cognizable object? In the case of others the practical tendency predominates. They will ask: does it make a vital difference for life and conduct whether we believe these things or not? And there are still others in whose thinking there is a blending of the theoretic and the pragmatic tendency. This latter disposition is my own personal attitude in the matter.

I. THE PERSONAL GOD.

The first of these theistic concepts is that of a personal God to whose intelligence, creative activity and goodness we refer the world of our experience as the ultimate ground of its existence and purpose. We should not classify as a theistic philosophy any system in which this conception is not fundamental. But is this concept one that has any theoretic value? Is the personal God, in whom the theist believes, an object for the understanding at all? This is the first crucial question.

Among cognizable objects, or objects that approve themselves to the understanding, are first a few axioms, or intuitive principles, which are immediately recognized as true the moment they properly confront the mind. It is absolutely impossible to doubt them. They are absolutely true. For example, "that a thing cannot both be and not be"; "that the sums of equals are equal," etc. Here we are in the realm of absolute and immediate certainty. A second class of cognizable objects, or facts that can be proved to the understanding to be absolutely true, and therefore cannot be doubted, are those that can be logically deduced from universal principles like the above, or from definitions given by the understanding. For example, given a few axioms and definitions and you can logically deduce the world of geometrical extension, the truth of which no man can doubt. Given the definition of a circle as a plane

figure every point in whose circumference is equally distant from a point within called the center, and you can prove a number of propositions following from this definition that cannot be doubted. All geometrical and mathematical truth is of this class that can be proved with absolute certainty.

Some of the older theistic philosophers, trained in geometry and logic, attempted to establish their philosophy after the fashion of mathematics. St. Anselm, for example, began his system with an intuitive principle which was supposed to be universal and immediately known to be true and, therefore, not to be doubted. "I have an idea of a being than whom nothing can be more perfect. If this being does not exist, then my idea is not an idea of a most perfect being. But I cannot doubt that I have such an idea, therefore this most perfect being must exist." It is needless to say that the inference of the existence of God from an idea of him is an unwarrantable venture of reason. Descartes' famous ontological argument is still more faulty. "I think, therefore I am." This is true. Descartes could not doubt this. But the next step is a daring leap. "Because I am, therefore God must be." From contingent being he infers necessary being, which is a logical fallacy, for this would make the universal deducible from a particular fact. The major premise of the ontological arguments is not true. We must frankly admit that the idea of God, as an intuitive principle immediately known to be true, does not bear the test of criticism. The fundamental conception with which theistic philosophy deals does not have the ring of absolute certainty about it that the truths of mathematics have. But this is not necessarily a cause for uneasiness; for an intuition, or axiomatic concept, no matter how immediate it is, and therefore prior to the individual's experience and that upon which all his experience depends, is, after all, upon close psychological analysis, found to be only a mental disposition with which the individual is born due to the racial experience of his progenitors. The famous *a priori* forms with which Kant begins his epistemology, and by means of which he discomfits

empiricism, are only the mental tendency with which every individual is born and with which he begins his mental experience; but the mental disposition itself is the result of a racial experience. We have no intuition of God simply because there has been no sensible racial experience of Him.

A third class of cognizable objects are those things of fact of which we can have sensible experience and which can, in a sensible way, be demonstrated to the understanding. Certainty here is not of the absolutely absolute kind that we find in mathematics. But it is still that kind of certainty, possible of demonstration through experience, which a reasonable man cannot doubt. What matter is in itself we may not know, but that it is something of which we can have sensible experience we cannot doubt. Whether an object of our experience is really green, or whether green is only a mental contribution to the object; whether cause and effect inhere in the object, as Hume supposed, or whether it is only the mind's mode of judging the object, as Kant claimed, we may not know, but that we have sensible experience of color and of cause and effect no reasonable man can doubt. This realm of things and the laws of their behavior is the field of science for which we must claim a degree of certainty sufficient for the practical business of life.

That the supersensible belongs to the realm of fact, demonstrable to the understanding, we must deny on valid epistemological grounds. We can have no sensible experience of God as a spirit, of the soul as an entity apart from its bodily manifestations, of immortality as a post-sensible reality, or of a spiritual world above and apart from the material world. The faith-faculty of Jacoby and of mysticism in general, which claims to penetrate beyond the sensible and apprehend the supersensible in itself, is a faculty which the most honest and painstaking psychological analysis fails to reveal. It is at this point that many students of Kant's first *Kritik*, and many modern students, trained in logical and laboratory methods of ascertaining truth, have turned sceptic. Feeling that logical

deduction from universal principles that cannot be doubted, or induction from things that can be sensibly experienced and demonstrated, are the only ways to truth, they relegate the supersensible to the limbo of superstition, or classify it as an object of mere credulity.

But Kant himself steered clear of the rock that shipwrecked the faith of many of his followers. Failing in his honest effort to find a theoretic basis for belief in God, he postulated a good and wise God, as we have already seen, for the sake of realizing the complete good, which is virtue in union with happiness. Fichte follows Kant in making God solely a postulate of the practical reason. And he is more consistently ethical than Kant himself in neglecting altogether the latter's conception of complete good as the coördination of virtue and happiness, and seeing it solely in virtue. For Fichte God is necessary, not as for Kant, in order to effect the ultimate union of happiness and virtue, but solely to secure the victory of virtue. For Fichte God is the most certain thing in the world, the one thing that cannot be doubted. Every triumph in virtue is a complete proof of the moral government of the universe.

This sounds good. But Kant's and Fichte's conception of God must be viewed in the light of their whole system; and when this is done it becomes evident that no God remains whose objective reality can in the least way approve itself to the understanding. Kant is a gentleman, and the personification of sincerity. There may be a being like the Christian God. Kant believes that there is, but denies that we can have any knowledge of him. In the absence of all theoretic proof we postulate him for the sake of morality and religion. Fichte, on the contrary, scorns the Christian idea of God as a being who thinks and feels. Such a conception is the height of vulgar superstition. In the last analysis, in the light of his subjectivism, his God is nothing more than the projection of the will of Johann Gottlieb Fichte. He said: "Ich bin der Brocken." In the same sense he might have said: "Ich bin Gott." His view of God, like his view of sticks and stones,

must be viewed in the light of his subjectivism in which everything is dissolved in the crucible of Johann Gottlieb's consciousness. Whatever we call *objective* is simply the subjective becoming another to itself for the sake of the complete realization of itself.

For the same epistemological reason certain theologians and pragmatic philosophers have denied that the supersensible can in any way at all become an object of knowledge. Ritschl, for example, influenced by the Kantian theory of knowledge that only phenomena can be known, broke away from traditional theology so far as it has to do with supra-phenomenal matters, the being of God, the creation of the universe, the nature of the soul, and the future life. All such transcendental subjects Ritschl rules out of religion. We can know nothing about them, and if we could, they would not fall within the religious realm, for religion moves wholly within the sphere of value judgments. No theoretical judgment whatever, whether it concerns God, or the world, or the soul, can have any religious significance. And so no universal objective validity can be claimed for religious truths, and the effort to establish them by demonstration is vain. This is thoroughgoing pragmatism. Ritschl postulates God only as an object of faith that shall give us the victory over the world.

Personally I have the sincerest respect for pragmatism which has its root in Kant's second *Kritik*. It steers clear of that cheap scepticism that had its source in Kant's first *Kritik*. But I feel, at the same time, that the pragmatic solution leaves unsatisfied a legitimate need in theistic thought. Pragmatism has been too ready to abandon the theoretic task. Even for the sake of morality we need a more substantial God than the mere postulation of a purpose that shall make possible the realization of the moral law, or that shall give us the victory over the world. Unless I can feel that God is something *real*, something more than an object of my good will, I cannot receive much encouragement from the idea. Even as a mere matter of faith from a pure practical point of view a thing

must, in some way, approve itself to the understanding. Kant has exerted a potent influence in this direction through his *Kritik of Judgment*, a work that was given to the English world only twenty years ago, and whose value for theistic thought is little recognized even to-day. In this last great work Kant maintains that God must be assumed, not only as an object of faith for the sake of morality, but also for the sake of satisfactorily explaining *life* and *collective nature*. The idea is a principle of judgment as well as of the practical reason. It is true that Kant steadfastly denies that the idea has any determinate value for judgment, but does this because of the restraint placed upon himself in the first *Kritik*. At this point students of Kant have gone beyond him, and have discovered theoretic value in the principle of explanation to which he has called our attention. The thing that must be assumed, as the only principle by means of which a known experience can be explained, is as *real* and as *true* as the experience that we must thus explain. Lotze was the first one to go beyond Kant and ascribe reality to the explanatory concept that we must assume for the sake of explaining our experience. Even Ritschl tacitly admits the truth of this, and it is part and parcel of the epistemology of both the new realism and the new idealism. It is my personal conviction, after years of toil and many painful misgivings, that the idea of a personal God is an explanatory concept for which we may claim the same degree of theoretic certainty that the scientist may claim for bodies and the laws of their behavior. In either case, on the last analysis, an *x* remains as far as the understanding is concerned. I may be able to show better than I can define what is implied in a *necessary explanatory concept*.

Let us suppose that on an excursion into a desert island, on which no human being was ever known to dwell, we should find a sand cone very perfectly formed. The fact of our discovery would not perplex us. The cone can be explained, satisfactorily to our understanding, by purely mechanical causes. The sand grains were blown together and heaped up

in this peculiar form by the wind. The cone was formed by a peculiar whirling motion of the wind. The whirlwind was formed by a warm current of air, moving in one direction, meeting a cool current of air moving in an opposite direction. We can account mechanically for the origin of the warm current and the cool current, for their meeting, and for the peculiar whirling motion which they originate. Air currents and sand grains sufficiently explain to our minds the fact of the sand cone on this desert island. We need assume nothing more than sand grains and air currents to account for the fact.

But let us suppose that a short distance from the sand cone we should find a regular decagon carefully inscribed in a circle in the sand. Here we have the same element, sand. But we need something more than air currents mechanically originated and moved to account for the decagon in the circle. We must assume a mind, some intelligent being, to explain this fact. This new fact of our discovery has all the evidences of mind in it, and it can be explained only by the assumption of mind. Either some of the anthropoid apes on the island must possess a high degree of intelligence, or else there must be some other being there whose mind works after the analogy of our minds. And such being the case we ask: is not the mind that we must assume, in order to explain this indubitable fact of a decagon in the circle in the sand, as real and as sure as the decagon itself which we see with our eyes?

Or let us suppose a still more complicated case. A short distance from the decagon in the circle we find some very strange characters in the sand. On closer investigation they are found to be letters, and the letters are arranged into words and the words into sentences. This arrangement of letters into words and words into sentences expresses thoughts and ideas. We cannot doubt that these strange characters in the sand mean something, that they express a purpose. How now shall we explain the existence of these strange characters in the sand, and especially the evidence of a design according to ideas? This new discovery in our desert island assigns us a problem

for solution, and to solve it we must adopt some satisfactory principle of explanation.

Let us apply to this strange discovery in this strange place some of the non-theistic philosophic methods that have been employed to explain the world of our experience. Here is one of our excursionists, influenced by Democritus and the atomists, who calls himself a materialist, who would explain this fact precisely like we explain the sand cone. Sand grains and motion are the only principles of explanation he needs. By a very peculiar motion the grains somehow got together in the form of the letters a, b, c, etc. After a while these combinations became permanent, and the letters a, b, c, remained in their present form. By mere motion again these letters found their respective places in words and these words became permanent forms. By and by, also by a peculiar motion, these words found their places in the sentences. The thoughts and purposes which we seem to find in this thing, and the arrangement of the whole according to ideas, are only illusions. The process has no meaning whatever; or, at best, the meaning that it has is derived accidentally. A blind flux of sand grains explains it all. Another member of our party, who calls himself a hylozoist, is not satisfied with this explanation of the materialist. He cannot conceive that a blind flux of lifeless sand grains could ever result in so wonderful a thing as these characters in the sand. He says the sand grains themselves are alive, but evidently unconscious, and they seek their places in the proper words and sentences precisely like the amœba seeks her food and avoids her enemies. But meaning and purpose other than that which we read back into the process, or that which the process has derived accidentally, there is none. Still others in our party, who call themselves by such names as pantheist, panpsychist, or panlogist, object to these explanations of our friends, the materialist and the hylozoist, and substitute a living principle, or substrate, back of the sand grains according to whose nature the sand grains take their place in the words and the words in

the sentences. But the substratic principle by which this is accomplished is unconscious of both the process and the end. One of them calls himself a Spinozist, or an absolutist, and calls the substrate the *All One*, which unfolds itself according to its nature, as extended sand grains on the one hand, and as thoughts and ideas on the other, but is itself unconscious of its unfolding. It aims at no end. Another calls himself a follower of Schopenhauer, or a voluntarist, and calls the substratic principle the *will-to-live*, and that it is the blind striving of each sand grain to live that brings about this piece of literature in the sand. Still another calls himself an Hegelian and says that the substratic principle is *logic*, and that the sand grains take their place in the letters and the letters in words and the words in sentences according to the principle of an unconscious logic, but that the unconscious process becomes conscious in the last step of the process (*i. e.*, in man). Still another calls himself a Darwinian and says that the whole perplexing thing is the result of a natural selection of sand grains and a survival of the fittest combinations. And finally there is one, influenced by Berkeley and Fichte, who calls himself a subjectivist, and denies that there are any real sand grains there at all. "This thing that you are arguing about," he declares, "is only the projection of our own minds. Mind is the only real thing there is." Thus they pass the time in delightful disputation.

No one would take seriously an attempt to explain this piece of literature in the sand on the above hypotheses. To explain it we must assume something more than sand grains in motion, or living but unconscious sand grains, or a living but unconscious substratic principle, according to whose nature, the process takes place unconsciously. To explain the existence, especially the purpose which the thing is on good grounds supposed to contain, we must assume a creative mind, a personal intelligence, who arranges the sand grains into letters, and the letters into words, and the words into sentences according to a concept of reason. There is present in this thing in the sand every evidence of mind, as we know and understand the workings of

our own minds, and it is only on the assumption of mind working according to ideas that we can explain it satisfactorily to our own understanding. Of the being who made these characters in the sand we may know nothing at all more than that he must be able to work according to a concept of reason. He may be deaf and color-blind, and minus both hands and legs. He may even be minus a body like ours, but minus a mind working after the analogy of our own minds he cannot be. If this principle of explanation should be denied us there is no other left by means of which we can explain the fact at all. Sand grains and motion can explain the product only when the motion that moves the sand grains is consciously directed. In the absence of hands and feet the man may have blown the sand grains together into this form in which we find them, but, regardless of the method, the blowing is consciously directed, according to a concept of reason. Without recourse to this method of explanation our supposed experience could not be explained. The methods which I have rather playfully applied to the explanation of this strange experience in our supposed desert island have all been applied with all seriousness to the world of our every day experience, but with scarcely more satisfaction, when the world is viewed as a collective whole, than they met with in the attempt to explain the letters in the sand.

When we turn our attention to the world of our common experience we find some things that we can explain on the ground of mere mechanism precisely like we explained the sand cone in our supposed island experience. In fact the whole inorganic world, as an isolated fact that has had a beginning in time and that occupies a place in space, can be explained without reference to any kind of intelligence immanent or transcendent. Given matter (whatever the term may mean) and motion to begin with, and the whole of the inorganic world can be explained satisfactorily to our understanding on the principle of mechanism. A sand cone is formed by action upon it from without. Given sand and a certain motion and you can account

for the cone. Likewise you can account for rocks, and mountains, and rivers, the sun, and the moon, and the planets. The astronomer and the geologist need no other principle of explanation. Matter in motion is the only God they need.

But in our experience with the world we find other things which we cannot explain on the assumption of motion or action upon it from without. No organism can be explained on this principle, whether it belongs to the vegetable or the animal kingdom. Take a tree for example. You cannot explain it on the ground of mechanism. It is not produced by motion upon it from without. It produces itself from within. It is both cause and effect of itself. It has the ground of both its existence and its perpetuation in itself. This is the case with any organism, or any thing that has life. It is a process in which means are used for certain specific ends, which cannot be said of the inorganic object. It is a process in which the whole depends upon all the parts and the several parts depend reciprocally upon the whole,—where the beginning anticipates the end and the end presupposes the beginning. In this realm of the organic the purely mechanistic explanation fails altogether. The only exact parallel to this characteristic of organisms is in a causal combination that can be thought according to a concept of reason. By a concept of reason a causal combination can be thought which, regarded as a series, would lead either forward or backward. In such a series the thing that has been called the effect may, with equal propriety, be called the cause of that of which it is the effect. For example, Kant says, “a house, no doubt, is the cause of the money received for rent, but also conversely, the idea of this possible income is the cause of the building of the house. Here we have the idea of a final cause, or an end set by reason, putting into operation the efficient causes.” Now it is only by such a concept of reason that we can satisfactorily explain the enigmatical characteristics of organized beings. Kant was quite right when he said: “it is absurd to hope that another Newton will arise in the future who shall make comprehensible to us the production

of a blade of grass according to natural laws which no design has ordered.”¹ Here then we must employ a different principle of explanation from the one employed in the explanation of rocks and crystals, mountains and rivers. The botanist and the zoölogist must employ a different principle of explanation from that of the astronomer and the geologist. Life must be explained on the assumption of life as its cause. Pure mechanism must be supplemented by the idea of life.

Still we must admit, in favor of the hylozoist and the philosopher of the unconscious principle of nature, that at this point we have no warrantable reason for positing a personal intelligence outside of the organic object itself. It is only too true that a large part of the organic world, perhaps the largest part of it, in fact the whole vegetable world, and a large part of the animal world and even the world of human beings, can be explained scientifically on the basis of an immanent but impersonal and purely unconscious teleology,—by a process that wonderfully, in a way surpassing all human intelligence, adapts means to ends without being conscious of either the ends or the process. All isolated processes of organic nature, all processes of bodily growth, healing, etc., all instinctive behavior of men and of animals, in fact every behavior of organic life short of action according to ideas and concepts which the reason gives itself can be explained satisfactorily to the understanding on the principle of an immanent but unconscious teleology; on the basis of what Professor William James calls “an apriori neural synthesis” which the organism inherits from its progenitors.

Thus far in our experience with the world we need not posit a personal intelligence outside of or apart from the object that needs to be explained. In fact such a principle would be in the way of a strictly scientific investigation of nature and her products. Neither need we posit a unitary intelligence, but we may, as a method of scientific explanation, posit many intelligences, in fact as many intelligences as there are types of life.

¹ *Kritik of Judgment*, p. 312.

Science, as pure science, needs no God. But we must not feel at this point that we have already explored and explained the whole world. Here is a weakness in many special scientists. When they have satisfactorily explained the isolated fact in which they are interested they conclude that they have explained the universe. The man of exact observation often lacks breadth of observation. The microscope and the telescope do not reveal the whole universe. There are some things that cannot be put into test-tubes, nor weighed in the scales.

The man who would explain the whole world after he has investigated a part of it makes a fatal mistake. We could explain quite satisfactorily to the understanding a single letter or several letters, in our island experience on the ground of mere mechanical motion of sand grains. But this method fails when we see that the letters are arranged into words and the words into sentences so as to give expression to an indubitable purpose. An isolated part of it could be explained mechanically, but the whole can be explained only as a work according to a concept of reason. And only that man who has taken a broad outlook upon the world can rightly explain it. The philosopher must be a man of broad vision as well as a man of exact observation. And a broad outlook upon the world convinces us of that kind of interdependence and interrelation of parts to the whole and of the whole to the parts, of the beginning to the end and the end to the beginning which is the distinguishing characteristic of an organism. The inorganic is the basis of the organic, and the material is the basis of the spiritual. The material anticipates the spiritual and the spiritual presupposes the material. The ultimate end of the process is rationality and morality; or as Kant has said: "man under moral laws." However well you may be able to explain isolated parts of the process by mechanical motion from without, or by an immanent but unconscious process from within, the whole process in which the parts are so related to the whole as to bring about so glorious a result as action according to moral ideals betrays every evidence of conscious mind as the animating principle of the whole.

We can no more think, when we view the world as a collective whole, that a mere blind motion of lifeless atoms, or an unconscious intelligence, or whatever the fundamental law of the universe may be supposed to be, has been the sole cause of the orderly progress from the inorganic to the organic, and from the organic to the rational and the moral, than we can think that the individual's whole life, his thinking and willing, as well as the fact of reflex movements, are the product of an unconscious discharge and counter-discharge of sensory and motor neurones. In his deliberations, of course, a man is determined to think according to the universal laws of thought. He cannot think contrary to them nor regardless of them. The course and progress of his thinking are determined by them. But these laws in and of themselves, apart from the use and control of them by the personal ego, are empty potentialities resulting in nothing orderly and consistent. Neither could all the laws that science has revealed to us have resulted in the orderly progress from the unicellular animals to the rational and moral in man, without the supervision of a conscious intelligence, or world-cause. In the world-whole are the trade marks of conscious mind, and it is only by the assumption of such a mind that the evidence which we experience can be explained. Just as we reason from the analogy of our own minds to the mind of Mr. Jones, whose mind in itself is as unknowable an x as anything can be, but to whom we must attribute mind in order to explain his behavior that could not be explained otherwise, so here we posit a personal intelligence as the origin and guiding principle of the world process, because no other principle explains it. Charles Darwin in the closing paragraph of his *Origin of Species* says that we can ultimately explain the origin of the species only on the ground that the Creator has breathed the principles of the evolution into the several progenitors or even into one original progenitor. Kant said this same thing long before Darwin. Tracing your explanatory principle backward you will always end with "a specification of nature" for which Kant says you must assume a divine or intuitive under-

standing. Every principle of explanation that has had the whole world in view and has denied this has begged the question at some important point sooner or later. Deny us this principle and the world as a collective whole must remain unexplained. This is the logical conclusion of a method of explanation to which Kant has called our attention in his last great work.

Kant then has blazed the way for modern theistic philosophy but, as we have seen, himself refused to follow the way which he pointed out. What he gives us with one hand he takes back again with the other. He admits that the only way that we can explain *organic nature* and *collective nature* is by the assumption of a personal God as ground and cause of the world, but stoutly denies that the idea has any value other than a mere explanatory one. Though we must assume such a being as the only explanatory principle that an understanding like ours can lay hold of there is, however, no guarantee that there is such a being. He makes use of the principle to help him out of a difficulty, but having used it, he throws it away. In the last two *Kritiken* Kant is evidently chafing under the limits of knowledge set down in the first *Kritik*. Only phenomena, or that which actively appears to our sensibility, can become an object of knowledge. The supersensible is viewed as something quiescent behind the phenomena. A criticism of Kant's epistemology has convinced us that there is no ground for his absolute distinction between the sensible and the supersensible. Kant himself admits this more than once in his *Kritik of Judgment* when he says the supersensible is the ground of the sensible. Kant himself has thus opened the way that leads beyond him, for if the supersensible is the ground of the sensible, it follows that the supersensible is revealed in the sensible, or that something of the noumenon appears in the phenomenon. Of course there is an x in this supersensible that evades knowledge, but this is also true of the sensible itself. The better we know the sensible the nearer we get to the x in the supersensible. Furthermore, Kant's logic suffers at this point because of the epistemological

limitations of the first *Kritik*. If the world can be explained to an understanding like ours only on the assumption of a personal God than the existence of this personal God is at least as sure as the world that must be explained by this assumption.

A second point of difficulty for Kant is the fact that this divine mind that must be assumed as an explanatory principle is *intuitive*, and must be able to see the whole before the parts and the end before the beginning, while our finite minds are purely discursive and always proceed in a linear series from cause to effect and from the known to the unknown. The two are absolutely different, says Kant and there is no reasoning by analogy from the one to the other. It is quite true that on the ordinary processes of reasoning we proceed only in a linear series from cause to effect. In the transpiration of an event in time we perceive the particular acts which make up the event only progressively, *i. e.*, moment by moment. We never see the end until the separate moments have transpired. Or in the solution of an ordinary problem in arithmetic we proceed step by step in the solution and see the conclusion only after the several steps in the proof have been taken. If the divine mind were of this purely discursive type, obliged to experience or prove a thing before it could be known, then obviously the assumption of such a mind would not help us explain the universe. And, on the other hand, if our finite minds were only and absolutely of this discursive type we could, as Kant has said, never reason by analogy from our minds to the divine mind. But there is a limited sense in which our finite minds operate intuitively. In those propositions in mathematics which we call axioms we see the end in the statement of the proposition. We see the conclusion before taking the various steps in the proof. We foresee the conclusion in the statement of the proposition, because we ourselves give the law to the proposition in question. And it is just this thing that the *intuitive understanding* of which Kant speaks does. It foresees the end of the process to which it itself has given the law. It is perfectly legitimate, therefore, for us to reason from the analogy of our own minds to

the divine mind, for the two are only infinitely different in degree and not absolutely different in kind. Modern theistic philosophy then agrees with Kant that the evidence of mind which we see in *life* and *collective nature* can be satisfactorily explained only on the assumption of mind as its cause, but goes beyond Kant in its claim that the thing that must be assumed for the sake of explaining the thing that is experienced, is as sure as the thing that is experienced. More than this is not claimed for the argument. This is the trend of thought of those theistic philosophers who honestly and conscientiously seek for a firmer basis than is afforded the mind in Kant's second *Kritik*, or in the ethics of Fichte, or the theology of Ritschl.

On the Character or Nature of the World-Ground.—The personal God as a necessary explanatory concept at which we have arrived is, however, a quite empty concept. The mere existence of a personal world-cause who acts according to a concept of reason is reasonably assured by the absolute necessity of assuming it for the sake of explaining our experience of the world; but what kind of a God he is, other than one who acts according to ideas of reason after the analogy of our own minds, is as undetermined as ever. In the older theistic philosophies the goodness of God was determined on apriori grounds. In the famous ontological arguments the goodness of God follows from the nature of infinite being like the angles of a triangle from its sides. An infinite being means a perfect being, and goodness is one of the attributes. But in the ontological arguments, as we have seen, the major premise does not bear rigid testing, and the conclusions drawn from it cannot be sounder than the premise itself. Modern theistic philosophy abandons all attempts to determine either the existence or the attributes of God on apriori grounds. What God is must be determined if determined at all, by the way in which he manifests himself in his world. Apart from a few propositions in mathematics which depend upon axioms, or definitions of the understanding, nothing can be known by us but that which

manifests itself to us in some sensible way. And this is just as true of our knowledge of God, and of our own souls, as it is of our knowledge of the plant and the animal. The only way then that we can form a valid opinion of God's character that has any theoretic value whatever is by an impartial judgment of his sensible manifestations of himself in the world in which we live. And in the world all those things must be considered as manifestations of the divine that are not due to human choices, or the sum of human choices and their consequences.

Three distinct views have been held as to the nature or character of the world-ground, namely that it is indifferent to any end, and, therefore, neither good nor bad; or that it is evil, or that it is good. Those who would explain the world as the unfolding of an unconscious principle hold to the opinion that this principle is indifferent to any end. Those who would adapt the world and life to themselves and their caprice are prone to pessimism, and call God evil and life undesirable. While those who rationally adapt themselves to the world and life are hopefully optimistic and call God good. Believing as we do, on good grounds, that God created the world according to concepts of reason, we have excluded the idea that he is indifferent to ends, and only two possible views remain for our consideration: either that God is evil or that he is good. Both of these views have been held in the past and are being held to-day.

The moralistic pessimist, Rousseau for example, claims that the evident tendency in life is to become immoral, and the more we progress in the arts and civilization the more immoral life becomes. The historians of the humanistic period went back to the beginnings of life and society to find perfection. The higher up the stream they went, the more evil they claimed to find. Others claim that there is nothing pleasurable or desirable in life. The sensationalistic pessimist, Schopenhauer for example, claims that all life is painful, and therefore, an evil. And the higher life flows the more painful and evil it becomes. Neither is it the universal belief of religion that the world is

good and that it is guided with a view to the good. A large part of the religious world sees nothing but evil in the world and looks and hopes for nothing but Nirvana, the total annihilation of all sensibility and personality. Furthermore, these men claim to draw their conclusions from the evidence offered in the court of the world. Rousseau goes to history and to experience to prove that the tendency in life is to become immoral. Schopenhauer claims to build up his system upon valid psychology, namely the fact that all striving, all desire, and all willing, is painful. Pain is an evil, and since all there is to life is this painful desiring, and striving, and willing, therefore, all life is bad, and our world is the worst possible world that could exist. Von Hartman differs from his master in that he thinks our world is the best possible world that could exist under the circumstances, but is still so bad that it would better not exist at all. In the *City of Dreadful Night*, by James Thomson, the personal God himself is addressed in terms of distrust and hatred.

“Who is most wretched in this dolorous place?
I think myself; yet I would rather be
My miserable self, than He
Who formed such creatures to his own disgrace.

“The vilest thing must be less vile than Thou
From whom it had its being, God and Lord!
Creator of all woe and sin! abhorred,
Malignant, and implacable.”

In these systems the world-ground, in whatever form it is conceived, is viewed as evil, and the goal of the world as undesirable.

All the philosopher can do is to examine, in a critical way, the evidence that is offered in the court of the world, and pass unbiased judgment upon it. This has been done by the theistic philosopher, and the conclusion reached is quite different from the above. The moral pessimist and the humanistic historian who went back to the beginnings of history and society for perfection have simply mistaken innocence and simplicity for per-

fection. But simplicity is not goodness, and innocence is not perfection. No one would deny that evils increase with the advance of civilization, but so also do virtues and the desirable things of life, and there is no way of determining with mathematical precision which overbalances the other and by how much. But the judgment of history is that there has been a moral evolution as well as a physical evolution. In fact there is more and plainer evidence for our faith in a moral evolution than there is for physical evolution, and in this moral evolution the good and desirable things of life have increased more than the evil and the undesirable. The physical world is not yet perfect, but physical evolution tends more and more toward perfection. And the better we get to know and the more carefully we make use of the universal laws of growth and development the more do we assure and hasten this perfection. The moral world is also still far from perfect, but the tendency is toward perfection, though the progress is almost imperceptibly slow and not always in a straight line. Pessimism is the product of individual disposition rather than the result of an impartial criticism of the evidence offered by experience. We know that the moral pessimism of Rousseau grew directly out of his own unhappy experience with the corrupt and unjust court life of Louis XV. The pessimism of Lord Byron grew out of a chronically bitter disposition. His moral vision was sickly and he saw all things morally black like the poor victim of jaundice sees all things yellow. Schopenhauer worked out his pessimism in the best of hotels and amid delightful surroundings, but the one little bit of psychology upon which his entire sensationalistic pessimism rests is unsound; for not all desiring, and willing, and striving, are painful experiences. Only that willing and desiring is painful where the object of the desire is not obtainable, or where its realization is postponed too indefinitely. But where there is hope that the object of our desire can be realized there can be the keenest pleasure in the pursuit and the striving. The pleasure that is derived from athletic contests and the chase, for example, refutes completely the one

bit of psychology upon which the huge and ugly mass of Schopenhauerian pessimism rests. The pessimism in the *City of Dreadful Night* is too common and too cheap to encourage a controversy. It is the pessimism of the vulgar spirit who would adjust the world and life to his own selfish caprice and chafes under the restraint which the universe imposes upon him.

It is evident, however, to a fair-minded man that the goodness of God is only a matter of opinion, and not a proposition that can be demonstrated to the understanding. But it can be demonstrated to the will. The man who wills to do God's will as it is revealed in the world, but especially in the Kingdom of God, will know that God is good, and that the cosmic system is good (using good in the sense of tendency toward final good). The man who will rationally endeavor to accommodate himself to the world and to life, instead of endeavoring to accommodate the world and life to himself, will find that life is not an evil experience. This is what the psychologist understands by spiritually discerning a thing. In this case we have, not a doubtful theoretic certainty, but an absolute practical certainty.

The pragmatist ultimately rests a case on the value it has for life and conduct. The pragmatic tests of truth are *coherence*, *consistency*, and *consequences*. It may not be contrary to reason to think the thing in question. The different parts of a system may not be contradictory to each other, etc. But above all other considerations the consequences of the thing believed or posited must be conducive to the highest good. The pragmatist asks: does the thing work? Does it make a vital difference whether or not I believe it? He tests the truth ultimately by the value it has for conduct. If two theories, like that of pessimism and meliorism, are contradictory, he will decide for the one that will have most value for life and conduct, or the one that works best. And there can be no doubt in the mind of a sensible man that the theory that the world is conducive to good and happiness has more value for life and conduct than any other theory that has been offered. In a world that is in-

different and, therefore, conducive to no particular end, or in a world that is conducive to a painful or an immoral end, life cannot be lived on as high and as noble a plain as it can in that kind of a world that offers some encouragement to the man who tries to be good. The idea of a good God as world-cause, though a proposition that cannot be demonstrated to the understanding, is necessary for conduct, and therefore, necessary to assume as a practical hypothesis.

Here Kant again blazed the way in the right direction for modern theistic philosophy, and he himself followed the full length of the way. Though, according to the Kantian epistemology as we have already seen, this idea of a personal God has no value from a theoretic point of view, yet Kant vigorously maintains that it is necessary to assume a personal God who is not only good, but also all-wise and all-powerful, in order to encourage us in the fulfilment of the moral laws of our being. If there were no such being, says Kant, there could be no encouragement that we could receive from anywhere in our effort to live up to the dictates of the moral law. Suppose the case of a righteous man (Spinoza, *e. g.*) who believes neither in God nor a future life, but who, because of his reverence for the moral law, would endeavor to practice it. He desires no advantage to himself in this world or in another. He wishes disinterestedly to establish the good to which this holy law directs all his powers. But his effort is bounded. From nature he receives no accordance with the purpose he feels himself obliged to accomplish. Deceit, violence, and envy will always surround him, and nature, which respects not his worthiness to be happy, subjects him to all the evils of want, disease, and untimely death, exactly like the beasts and the evil men around him. So it will be until one wide grave engulfs them altogether, honest or not, it makes no difference, and throws him back,—who was able to consider himself a final purpose of creation,—into that abyss of the purposeless chaos of matter from which all were drawn. Under such conditions, Kant maintains, the purpose which the moral law enjoins upon us to bring about with all our powers

must be given up as hopeless. "Thus there is found a pure moral ground of practical reason for assuming this cause (*i. e.*, a good God) in order that we may no more regard this effort of reason as quite idle, and so run the risk of abandoning it from weariness."² "That man is morally unbelieving who does not accept that which, though impossible to know, is morally necessary to suppose."³ This is the trend of thought of modern theists whose bent of mind is predominantly practical. A God who is all-wise and all-good is made an object of moral faith from a practical point of view.

On the Relation of God to the World.—If God must be assumed for the sake of satisfactorily explaining the world of our experience, and if his goodness must be assumed for the sake of properly adjusting our lives to the world, or for the sake of winning the victory over it, it still remains to determine the relation of this good God to the world. Three different explanations have been offered. These are: deism, theism, and pantheism.

Deism is the product of the English and German enlightenment of the early eighteenth century. It believes in a personal God who is the creator of the world in which we live. But God created the world absolutely perfect by an act of his omnipotence and omniscience. The world is a perfect machine, so perfectly made and so admirably adjusted in all its parts that it never again needs any interference on the part of God. Having made the world so perfectly, God withdrew from it, leaving it, not to priests and prophets, but to the natural laws imbedded in it. In the system of the Third Earl of Shaftesbury the perfection consists of the beauty and harmony of its various parts, and religion consists of enthusiastic admiration of this beauty. The English utilitarians saw in the world a perfect adaptation of means to man's happiness. But no matter what the end of the world may be conceived to be, the deists all agreed that the world was made so perfect once for all as to

² *Kritik of Judgment*, section 86, remark.

³ *Introduction to Logic*, p. 60.

need no further action on the part of God. Reimarus said: "Only bunglers need to assist their machines afterward, but it is unworthy of a perfect intelligence to come into such a humiliating position." The metaphysics of Leibniz can readily be construed into perfect agreement with this phase of deism. The "pre-established harmony" means such a perfect making and adjusting of all the parts of creation as never again to need any interference by way of miracle or any such thing. Having made the world, God retired from the scenes of his labor where he remains in inglorious inactivity while the clock runs out.

In traditional theism God is also viewed as the creator of the world in which we live. In the beginning God created the world good and to his own delight and then retired into his sabbatic rest in a local heaven above and apart from the earth. Then something went wrong on the earth. There was a fall from this good estate, and since then God has had to interfere with the world which he created. This interference is in spite of law as well as by means of law. In fact miraculous interventions which dispense with law are considered specially divine. The web of natural law is constantly broken through to chasten sinners and to comfort saints. There is a sharp antithesis between God and the world, between the natural and the spiritual, the divine and the human. God communicates his will by telegrams from the sky, born by angelic messengers, to specially commissioned men to receive them. In deism God has nothing further to do with the world, while in this type of theism he is constantly setting the world to rights. In one case the machine is so perfect as never to need any attention, while in the other case it is constantly in need of repairs. But in each case the divine machinist is outside of the world.

In pantheism God is brought down from heaven into the world, and is identified with it. God no longer acts upon the world, for God is the world. Everything in the world, which seems to have a distinct existence, is simply a flux from God, and will again flow back into God. Nothing in the world has any real identity of its own. The finite being is simply a mode

of the divine being, a conscious individual for a while, only to be reabsorbed into the All One. Every event in the world is therefore divine. In place of the above sharp distinction between the divine and the human, the material and the spiritual, all real distinction vanishes, and good and evil look alike. Both religion and piety become a stoic resignation to an inevitable fate.

There is some truth in each one of these explanations, and modern theism seeks to combine these different elements of truth into a single, coherent system. With deism and the old type of theism it emphasizes the personality of God and his moral transcendence, while with pantheism it emphasizes the immanence of God. Though transcending the world as the moral goal toward which the world moves, God is not outside of the world, but in it. Otherwise we would have to abandon all hope of ever knowing anything about God. A God at rest behind phenomena is a God unknown and unknowable. God can be known to an understanding like ours only as he manifests himself in a sensible way through the sensible universe. This is the supreme importance of the Incarnation from the standpoint of a theory of knowledge. In Jesus we have the full and final issue of the divine immanence in the world. In him God manifests himself sensibly to the understanding. In Jesus we see God with our eyes, hear him with our ears, and touch him with our hands. God immanent in Christ becomes known to us in exactly the same way that any other person becomes known to us. If you deny this immanence of God in the world you remove him absolutely from the realm of the knowable. God is in the world like the soul is in the body, and he reveals himself through the world precisely like the soul does through the body.

God however manifests himself in the world of nature as well as in the realm of spirit, and a comprehensive view of the truth may not ignore this fact. The natural and the spiritual are not two mutually exclusive and contradictory spheres of existence, but together form the whole world of God; and it is only in a

system that comprehends the two that God can be rightly known and appreciated. The reality which our theology and philosophy have to explain is not a hemisphere, but a sphere, the lower side of which is physical and the upper side spiritual. In the one realm God manifests himself as natural phenomena, and in the other as spiritual phenomena. Science, as pure science, deals exclusively with natural phenomena, while religion deals exclusively with spiritual phenomena. But our philosophy attempts to comprehend these two hemispheres of reality in a unified, coherent system. It tries to get rid of neither matter nor spirit. It believes that the natural is the necessary and the absolutely indispensable condition for the revelation and the realization of the spiritual. Through the two hemispheres runs the unifying idea of the good which must be realized by us through the adjustment of our lives with God's laws both natural and spiritual. It conceives of the natural in the accomplishment of the good, and of spirit as manifesting and realizing itself by means of the natural.

Modern theism, influenced on this point by the systems of thought that have had their source in Spinoza, regards the relation of the infinite spirit to the infinite universe after the analogy of the relation of the finite spirit to the finite body. If the relation is any other than this it is such as cannot be known by us. A little reasoning from analogy may help to set this view more clearly before those to whom this may seem a venturesome position. If we ask: what is the individual, or what am I? the only answer that we can give is that I, or the real ego, am a self-conscious activity. But we cannot conceive of this self-conscious activity save as it is incorporated. The best answer that I can give is that I am a soul that has a body. And this soul can be known as a personality only as it expresses and individualizes itself by the use of its body and the appropriation of its environment. So God, the infinite ego, is a self-conscious, spiritual activity; but we cannot know him save as he expresses himself in and through his world in both its natural and spiritual realm. All attempts to know God

apart from this expression of himself in nature and in redemptive history have been fruitless. Mysticism which claims to apprehend the unrevealed God rests upon an untenable theory of knowledge. We can know God only in his relation to his world. And where is the seat of the soul, or the ego? The ancients said in the blood. Descartes said in the pineal gland. And some moderns have said in the cortex of the brain. The fact however is that the seat of the ego is in no particular part of the body at the exclusion of the other parts, but is rather in the whole of the body, pervading every fiber and avenue of it. Still the soul manifests itself more through the intellect, and the feelings, and the will, and their respective bodily organs, than through the organs of locomotion. So, likewise, God, the infinite ego, is not confined to a local heaven, but is rather in the whole of the universe, expressing himself in the falling rain and the growing grass, dwelling more fully however in the human consciousness than anywhere else, and expressing himself more clearly in redemptive history than in natural history. It may also be asked: what is the form of the soul, or ego? Popular opinion, as ghost-lore informs us, believes that the soul resembles the form of the body. The fact however is that we know absolutely nothing about any such thing as the form of a soul. We know that there is something that animates our bodies, but apart from its bodily manifestations we know nothing about it. Personality simply means action according to conscious ideas and purposes. If we ask: when, how, and at what point does the ego become self-conscious? we must say we cannot know. We only know that such a thing actually takes place, but how, or when, we cannot know. Consciousness is that indefinable characteristic of mental states that causes us to become aware of them; but at what point in our life we become aware of them, and how we do so, is a mystery which no one can solve. Huxley says: "How it is that anything so remarkable as states of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissues is just as unaccountable as the appearance of the Jinnée when Aladdin

rubbed his lamp." If we cannot understand how the life, or soul, or ego, or whatever you may wish to call it, which pervades our own bodies, becomes a self-conscious, personal reality, and yet know that it is so,—why should we throw up our hands at the thought that God, the infinite ego, is the animating soul of the universe, a self-conscious personality, related to this universe like our own souls are to our own bodies. In either case the soul is more than the body that it animates; and in either case there is an *x* that evades our mental access to it.

II. THE WORLD AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

In its conception of the material world our type of theism agrees essentially with the view of the new realism, which is a reaction from Locke's world from which all colors and sounds, etc., are washed out, and from the subjectism of Berkeleanism and Fichteanism, which leaves no world at all. The world with all its colors and sounds, etc., whatever it may be as a "thing in itself," is *real* for our experience, and we must not dissolve it in the crucible of consciousness like subjectivism does; nor metamorphose it into an ideal that is contrary to our experience of it like idealism has done; nor must we make a God of it like pantheism does; nor, on the other hand, degrade it into a vile plaything of a demi-god or satan like traditional theism does. The world of extension is something other than God and also something other than a projection of our own wills merely to give realization to a moral purpose. The world of matter is not only real for our experience, but also indispensable for our life. Tastes and smells, colors and sounds, may be mental contributions to things. So, likewise, may cause and effect be mental contributions to things. But this is not the essential thing. There *must* be something other than sensation, or there could be no sensation. There is something external to the mind which arouses sensations, and into which the mind projects tastes and smells. So, too, there is something external to the mind which the mind binds together in cause and effect. This something

other than sensation, or other than consciousness, upon which both sensation and consciousness depend, is something *real* for our experience and the necessary medium of mental and spiritual life. To dissolve the material world in consciousness, or to metamorphose it into an ideal which our common experience flatly contradicts, is playing with the world, and is not helping us to understand it. But while our type of theism agrees with the new realism in reclothing mother earth in her homely garb, which common-sense experience claims for her, it agrees with the new idealism, on the other hand, in the conception that ultimate reality is to be sought in the realm of spirit. We are emerging from the crass materialism which followed upon the heels of sensationalism and the laboratory method, which made mind and spirit only the product of material organization. Instead of this, matter is viewed as the instrument of spirit. This is the view of such men like Eucken and Bergson in philosophy, and men like Sir Oliver Lodge in science.

The Personality of the Finite Individual.—Theism cannot, like pantheism, or like the type of thought that has been influenced by Spinoza, view the finite being as a mere mode of the divine being. The finite spirit is a being with a distinct individuality. He is distinct from God on the one hand, and from the corporeal world on the other. It is psychologically impossible for a normal man to view himself otherwise. My absolute distinctness from all other beings and things is immediately given in the process of apperception. The impress *mine* which I find on all my mental experiences is a form of apperception as much as time and space are forms of sensible perception; and both are the product of experience. The former is the product of individual experience, while the latter is something with which the individual is born and with which he begins his individual experience; but he is born with this mental tendency or mode because of the racial experience of his progenitors. I am willing to define mind with the most scientific modern psychologists as simply the sum of all our mental activities. Scientific psychological analysis can dis-

cover only mental processes, but cannot discover the mind-stuff of the older psychology. My mind, so far as strictly scientific methods can discover, is simply the sum of my separate acts of thinking, feeling and willing. Yet I apperceive these acts of thinking, feeling and willing as *my acts*, though they may be separated by years of time. A thought that I thought, and an emotion that I felt a year ago is remembered to day as *my* thought and as *my* emotion. I can no more think of them as not mine, as God's for example, than I can perceive a hard object as soft, or a red object as green. My mental constitution compels me to stamp the impress *mine* upon these separate mental acts. Every time that I recognize a past experience it is by means of the feeling that it belongs to me; it is *my* experience. Without this feeling of "at-homeness," as Professor Titchner puts it, with our past mental experiences there could be no memory at all. Every time I remember a thing I bear indubitable testimony to my distinctness as a being, to my otherness from all other persons and things: in short to a substantial personality of my own.

Again in those acts in which I feel moral responsibility and obligation I cannot, by any means or in any possible way, view myself as other than a distinct person. It is not God, it is not the world, it is not society, but it is *I myself* who does this. It is *my* act. It is as impossible to feel otherwise as it is to think that the sums of equals are unequal, or of an effect without a cause. If then in the process of apperception I cannot but perceive my separate acts of thinking, feeling, and willing as *my acts*; if in every act of memory I recognize a past experience only as I feel a certain indubitable familiarity with it, *i. e.*, that it was *my* experience in the past; and if in those acts which involve moral obligation and the like I *must* feel that it is *I myself* who does this, then surely it is folly to cast aside these psychological laws of my being and persuade myself by logic, or by prejudice to a theory, that I am nothing,—that I am only a mode of an all-inclusive being like the individual oak is a concrete mode of the genus oak. I

must view myself according to the laws of my being, and this means that I must view myself as something distinct from everybody and everything else, a real, substantial something. Any other view is playing with personality instead of trying to understand it seriously.

In addition to these psychological laws, which force us to this immediate feeling of our absolutely distinct individuality, we posit the otherness of the finite spirit for the sake of morality and religion. There is a practical reason for our doing this in addition to the psychological necessity of doing it. In a pantheistic system, if it be materialistic, like the system of Parmenides can on good grounds be construed to be, there can be only a world of geometrical extension. There can be physics but no ethics. If the system is spiritualistic, like the system of Spinoza is claimed to be, and like the system of Paulsen is, then there can be action like the going round of the wheels in a mill that are turned by a power external to them, but there can be no action involving any real responsibility or obligation. As Professor Francis Peabody has said: "A log in the stream can float only with the stream." Or as Hegel has said in his criticism of the identity philosophy, "It is the night when all cows are black." Good and evil look alike in such a system for everything is divine. In the end every individual thing returns again to its source to begin a new course. In such a system every thing worthy of the name religion and morality must perish. "Both love and religion seek for union, but it is not the union of absorption or fusion, but rather the union of mutual understanding and sympathy, which would disappear if the otherness of the persons were removed. Any intelligible or desirable longing after God or identification with him would vanish if we would confuse the persons."⁴

And finally, in any system where the otherness of the world and the individual is lost sight of, the universe itself becomes involved in absurd contradictions. If the universe is God then all the irrationality which we see in it is just so much evidence

⁴ Bowne, *Personalism*, p. 284.

for the irrationality and stupidity of God. The irrationality and sinfulness of men is simply God's own activity, and all confidence in God as a being of reason and goodness will be severely shaken. Professor Royce, the greatest living exponent of absolutism, in his *Studies of Good and Evil*, Chapter I, says: "God and I are identically one and the same person; therefore, it follows that when I suffer God suffers, not sympathetically, but suffers identically what I suffer." It can only follow from this that God has the toothache when I have it because we are identically one and the same person. But if God has the toothache when I have it because God and I are identically one and the same person, then it follows, for the same reason, that God lies when I lie, steals when I steal, curses himself when I curse him, and makes a fool of himself when I make a fool of myself. This surely is the night when all cows are black. In such a system all morality and religion, as well as all common sense, are ship-wrecked.

Determinism or Indeterminism? or the Freedom of the Individual.—Theism posits the freedom of the individual as well as his otherness. But philosophic theism does not posit freedom as a fact that can be proved to the understanding, but, on the one hand, only as a concept necessary to assume for the sake of explaining the whole of our conduct; and, on the other hand, as a concept necessary to believe for the sake of morality. Those familiar with the discussions on the problem of the will know only too well that neither determinism nor freedom can be proved or disproved to the understanding. Kant has shown this in a most ingenious way in the third antimony of the *Kritik of Pure Reason*. You can argue either for or against either determinism or freedom with pretty much the same show of reason. It is understood that by freedom we no longer mean capriciousness, or that metaphysical idea of freedom that the individual, in any act at any time, is absolutely free to choose one course as readily as another. This it would be folly to maintain. But, on the other hand, it is just as great and as serious folly to hold that the

individual's course in life is as absolutely determined by external and internal forces beyond his control as is the course of a billiard ball when struck with a cue. To say as certain advocates of free will have said: that we are free to choose between right or wrong, at any time under any condition, is saying what is plainly not true. And to say as the determinist says: that if we knew men as well as we know the parallelogram of forces we could foretell their actions as accurately as we can foretell the direction a ball will take when struck by two known forces is plainly begging the question. *If* we knew men as well as we know the parallelogram of forces we could do this; but it is very evident that the most careful psychological analysis of bodily movements, of attention, of motives, of desires, and deliberations has left an undetermined x . And this x equals an element of freedom without which moral personality can in no manner or means be explained, or accounted for. Huxley in his masterful *Essay on Automatism*, in which he argues that men and animals are merely machines plus consciousness, fails utterly in accounting for the difference between the machine-like actions of the somnambulist and those abnormal individuals, who by accident or otherwise have lost their consciousness, and the actions of the normal, wakeful, conscious man. Kant said if our minds were of the intuitive type, which has been described, we might see that causation and freedom are at bottom one and the same thing. But since our minds are not of this intuitive type every serious, sensible man must do what the serious, sensible Kant did namely make use of the two seemingly contradictory principles in an honest effort to understand the whole of our experience.

An important thing in this difficult matter is that we learn to distinguish between the logical and invariable sequence of things and facts as they occur in space and time, and causation by the will according to an idea which it gives itself. Given a thing or a fact and you have something that is dependent on something else, and that will be followed by something else. You can never find the first thing or fact and so what you find

is always dependent upon something else as its cause and will be followed by something else as its effect; and so all through the world of facts and things. This field of invariable sequence is the field of science: of astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology and history. It is the duty of these sciences to trace out this sequence of facts and things and apply the knowledge derived from this investigation to life. These sciences need no other principle of investigation than that of causation. In fact they can make scientific use of no other principle.

But there is another world that cannot be understood on the principle of rigid causation and invariable sequence. Kant claims that the moral *ought* is something that the will gives to itself as much as the understanding gives the idea of cause and effect to things and facts. And freedom, therefore, is a principle of the will as much as causation is a principle of the understanding. Whether Kant is right or not in this contention makes little difference, for we know that there is a world with which we must deal whose foundation is the *moral ought*; and the *I ought* necessarily presupposes an *I can*; and the *I can* plainly implies freedom of some kind. "You can," says Kant, because you ought." If I cannot do the thing that I *ought* to do; if I am in all respects determined to act just so and in no other way like the billiard ball is determined to move in a certain direction, then there is no longer room for any such word as *ought*, and the whole science of ethics as the theory of what men *ought* to do collapses. All feelings of responsibility and obligation will, on deeper insight and better knowledge, be seen to be only an illusion. In such a case there might still be treatises on ethics, but they would of necessity be very different from those with which we are familiar. Professor Thorndike, of Columbia University, has a most fascinating article on: Is Meliorism possible on the basis of a purely psychological explanation of volition? The end which he posits is the old familiar one of happiness. But happiness depends, on the one hand, on the way the neurones are stimulated, and on the other

hand, on the way the neurones discharge or function. Too much stimulation, or the wrong kind of stimulation, will result in pain, and a clogged discharge of neurones will also result in pain. The betterment of the individual, therefore, will depend altogether upon proper *neural nutrition* and a *pleasant environment*. Moral education, legislation for the prevention of crime, theories of the good, etc., will give way to the proper oiling and setting of the physical machine. To keep it from friction is the most you can do for it. Ethics will be defined in terms of physiology.

The kind of freedom we are concerned about is immediately given in the feeling of obligation and responsibility. A man cannot think of himself as a mill-wheel turned by a crank when acting with deliberation. He can do this just as little as he can think of an effect without a cause. So long as he feels the least obligation or responsibility he *must* also feel himself free to do or not to do the act in question. So long as he can feel himself blameworthy or praiseworthy he *must* view himself as under a different principle of causation from that when he views himself as a man having red hair, or being only five feet tall. No man likes to have red hair, and no man likes to be only five feet tall, but in this case it is impossible for the man to feel himself blameworthy, while in an act of deliberate wrong doing it is impossible not to feel it. In the one case he views himself as under the principle of causality, and in the other as under the principle of freedom, and the one is just as true as the other. Freedom, therefore, is as much a category of the practical reason as causation is of the pure reason. Fichte, who is more completely ethical than Kant, is also more positive on this question of freedom. Freedom is the most positive thing in the world for Fichte. He says: "I cannot doubt my freedom and I cannot doubt my purpose without at the same time doubting myself."

Neither has the world of common sense been able to consider man a mill-wheel turned by the crank of universal causation, and it would be a sad day if such could be the case. Take for

example, the moral degenerate, who is the pitiful and disgusting slave of his passions. His present choice is always, so far as we can determine, anteceded by an evil desire and his act therefore determined. But we still blame him for his conduct, or what amounts to the same thing from a practical point of view, for the desires which determine his present choice. We still attribute freedom to him at some point. Even in his case we do not expect his choice to follow invariably from his desires like the properties of a circle from its definition, or the angles of a triangle from its sides. We view even his conduct as the result of a different principle of causation from the color of his hair, or the height of his body. Without this principle of explanation you simply cannot explain the whole of human conduct. Surrender this principle and you surrender the principle that differentiates man from the brute, and the moral man from the degenerate. As little as science could get along with the arbitrary behavior of things in space and time, just so little could morality get along with the rigid mechanical determination of the will. Just as universal causation is the positive presupposition of science, so is ethical freedom the positive presupposition of morality; and since morality is as real as physics and biology, freedom is as sure a fact as causality. Freedom and causality are not necessarily contradictory principles one of which must be thrown overboard, but both are *true* and *necessary*, at our present stage of advancement, for the investigation and understanding of the whole of our experience. The man who will refuse to employ both principles must leave some important things unexplained. Of the two, causation is the more important principle, and we should make use of it just as far as it is possible to use it, but should not, out of prejudice or for any other reason, refuse to make use of the supplementary principle of freedom wherever causation fails to explain. It is this and nothing more that theistic philosophy does.

On the Immortality of the Individual.—The idea of personal immortality has a place in theistic philosophy, but merely as a matter of faith from a pure practical point of view. Though

of great practical value, the idea has no theoretic value whatever. Our immortality cannot be determined by any valid process of cognition, and is, therefore, not an object of knowledge at all, but merely an article of faith. The ground of this belief is quite different from that of the other theistic tenets into which we have inquired.

It is true that the human race has always believed in personal immortality. There never has been a race or clan, however isolated from the rest of mankind, that did not believe in the future life of the individual. "This is," as James Freeman Clark says, "not because one race or clan received this faith or tradition from another. It has sprung up independently, in all parts of the world, and in all ages, among the ancient Egyptians and the ancient Hindus, among those who lived in the frozen zone and among those who inhabit the burning regions of Africa. The travellers who visited for the first time the Esquimaux of Greenland, or the negro tribes on the Niger, who first saw the natives of the islands of Oceanica, and the Papuans of the Eastern archipelago, found among them all a well developed belief concerning a future life. This did not come by any process of reasoning, it came as the result of some instinctive operation of the mind itself."⁵

Personally I am inclined to attribute a great deal of weight to this universal belief of mankind. Something that is believed by practically the whole human race, through all time and under all conditions, must make an impression upon any serious mind, and is well worth an honest consideration. But we must admit, when we come to analyze what Mr. Clark calls "an instinctive operation of the mind," and inquire impartially into the matter out of which this endearing belief is woven, that we fail to find anything that will allow us to classify the idea among the things of fact or knowledge. It is not an intuition, or something that is immediately recognized as true the moment it confronts the mind. It is not an immediate feeling grounded in some sensible experience like the idea of freedom,

⁵ *Idea of a Future State in all Religions.*

which was examined in the preceding section. It is not a necessary explanatory concept like the idea of a personal Creator who must be assumed for the sake of explaining something that we experience. It cannot properly be classified even as an instinct of the human race, for an instinct in an individual is a neural tendency with which the individual is born as the result of a sensuous racial experience. No individual is born with an instinct that its racial history cannot account for. The only way that the idea of immortality could be made out an instinct in the individual or the race would be by the adoption of Plato's theory of knowledge that, prior to our present state of existence, we existed in another state, and that all our knowledge is simply a reminiscence of that previous experience. On this ground immortality would be an echo in our minds of a preexistent experience. But we must deny, on empirical grounds, that the race has had, or can ever have, any sensible experience of immortality, or of any data out of which the idea could be developed. The idea is, therefore, plainly not a matter of the understanding at all. It cannot in the least be proved or disproved to the understanding.

The idea of immortality can be rightly viewed and appreciated only as a matter of pure practical reason, or the will. The idea no doubt has its ultimate ground *in the desire to live forever*. But this desire is not of low and vulgar origin, but is itself born of an innate sense of the dignity and worth of the human being and the desirability of life, a feeling shared by the naked savage of the tropics and the fur-covered inhabitant of the polar regions. It may be that the practical reason, in a categorical way, impresses the form of timelessness and spacelessness upon our moral efforts and experiences, just like sensibility impresses the apriori forms of space and time upon all the sensible data which we experience. Kant does not explicitly state this, but there is no evidence that he would deny it. He does say that the moral law, with its categorical imperative, presupposes an infinite progress and this, in turn,

presupposes an infinite duration of time. And the man who aims at moral perfection, as every good man ought to do, must view himself and his efforts in this infinite perspective. If man were only a phenomenon in space and time his efforts to live up to the full requirements of the moral law could receive no adequate encouragement. There is therefore a pure practical reason for assuming the immortality of the individual.

In the absence of all theoretic proof, I will be pragmatist enough to admit the idea for the sake of the value it has for life and conduct. The best and most noble conduct is fostered in an atmosphere of rational faith in the immortality of the individual. I say rational faith, for I do not mean the lazy man's desire for eternal rest, nor the selfish man's desire for eternal reward, nor the religious hedonist's desire for eternal happiness. But wholly apart from these considerations, that man who believes that he is an immortal being, capable of infinite progress in moral goodness and excellence and worthy of endless duration, will live this present life more nobly than the man who believes that he is only a transitory creature of the dust, whose end will be on the refuse heap like the other worthless things around him. And the man who believes this same thing to be true of his neighbors will be inspired to do more for them than the man who believes that they are only intelligent animals whose highest need is physical comfort.

The sage who wrote the Book of Wisdom put these significant words upon the lips of those who do not believe that they are immortal beings. "Our life is short and tedious, and in the death of man is no remedy; neither is any man ever known to return from the grave: for we are all born at an adventure, and shall be afterward as though we had never been; for the breath of our nostrils is as smoke, and a little spark is the moving of the heart, which being extinguished, our bodies are burned to ashes, and our spirits vanish into the soft air, and our names shall be forgotten in time, and no man shall hold our works in remembrance, and our life shall pass away like the trace of a cloud, and shall be dissipated like the

mist that is driven away by the beams of the sun, and overcome with the heat thereof." . . . "Come on, therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present, and let us speedily use the creatures as in youth. Let us fill ourselves with costly wines and ointments, and let no flower of the spring pass us by; let us crown ourselves with rosebuds before they are withered; let none of us go without his share of voluptuousness; let us leave tokens of our joy in every place, for this is our portion and our lot is this." I believe with the author of the Book of Wisdom that a loss of rational faith in immortality has a tendency to react unfavorably upon life and morality. Convince men, like Epicurus tried to do, that this present life is all there is to living, that death is final extinction with absolutely nothing to fear or hope, and they will eagerly drain the cup of this life of all the sensuous pleasures it can hold.

On the contrary, as Marcus Dods says, "teach men to believe in a future life and you strengthen every moral sentiment and every God-ward aspiration by revealing the true dignity of human nature. Make men feel that they are immortal beings, that this life, so far from being all, is the mere entrance and first step to existence; make men feel that there is open to them an endless moral progress, and you give them some encouragement to lay the foundations of that progress in a self-denying and virtuous life in this world. Take away this belief, encourage men to think of themselves as worthless little creatures that come into being for a few years and are blotted out again forever, and you destroy one mainspring of right action in men. It is not that men do noble deeds for the sake of reward: the hope of reward is scarcely a perceptible influence in the best men; but in all men trained as we are, there is an indefinite consciousness that, being immortal creatures, we are made for higher ends than those of this life, and have prospects of enjoyments which should make us independent of the grosser pleasures of the present bodily conditions." Personally I believe that in the rational conviction that we are immortal creatures of infinite moral possibilities and

worthy of an endless duration lies one of the strongest springs of noble conduct.

And beyond all this I frankly confess that I would not consider life worth living for a large proportion of the people, perhaps not for most of us, if it were not for the hope of an eternal hereafter in which our moral natures can be perfected, our deepest hopes fulfilled, and justice realized. If, after bearing the toil and enduring the pain, we had to lie down and be no more, the good and the happiness of this present life, for most of us, would hardly be worth the toil and the pain with which they must be purchased. And even if this hope should in the end prove to be an illusion of the will, I would still consider it of as much value for poor, struggling, suffering humanity as the most positive truth that science and philosophy have been able to discover. "Let us not forget," says Victor Hugo, "and let us teach it to all, that there would be no dignity to life, that it would not be worth while to live, if annihilation were to be our lot. What is it that alleviates and sanctifies toil, which renders men strong, wise, patient, just, at once humble and aspiring, but the perpetual vision of a better world, whose light shines through the darkness of this present life? For myself I believe profoundly in that better world; and after many struggles, much study, and numberless trials, this is the supreme conviction of my reason as it is the supreme consolation of my soul." . . . "How greatly lessened are our finite sufferings where there shines in the midst of them an infinite hope." There is more value for struggling, suffering humanity in the simple faith of Whittier's "Snow-bound" than in all the learned treatises ever written on "virtue for virtue's sake" when, in the same breath, we are told that this virtue is as ephemeral as the paint on the butterfly's wing. Fifty years after the snow-storm, and after only two of the whole family circle were left, Whittier wrote:

"Yet love will dream and faith will trust
That somewhere, somehow, meet we must.
Alas for him who never sees

The stars shine through his cypress trees!
 Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
 Nor looks to see the breaking day
 Across the mournful marbles play!
 Who has not learned, in hours of faith,
 The truth to flesh and sense unknown,
 That life is ever Lord of death,
 And love can never loose its own."

Such faith is born of the consciousness of the infinite dignity and worth of human nature, which can receive proper encouragement only in the perspective of an eternal world.

III. MORAL VERSUS METAPHYSICAL MONISM.

In the sphere of the moral, or the ethical, infinite spirit and finite spirit approach each other. But the end of the process is not viewed as a fusion of personalities, or the loss of the finite in the infinite, but as a harmony of wills, a oneness of character, *a moral monism*. This is in perfect agreement with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, the most original and profound teacher of religion and ethics in history, and the final prophet of theism. "I and the Father are one," says Jesus. "The Father in me and I in the Father. . . ." "He that beholdeth me, beholdeth Him that sent me." And "he that hath seen me hath seen Him that sent me." That this oneness is a oneness of will, or of character, is evident, for Jesus everywhere emphasizes his own individuality as distinct from that of the Father. Jesus and God are one ethically and morally, and not in any metaphysical sense. In Jesus God dwells in all the fulness of his moral and ethical perfection. Jesus is the full and final illustration of the divine immanence in the world. Here we find the only monism that has any practical significance for life and conduct, a moral monism which we believe to be the goal of the world. A metaphysical monism, if it is a monism of substance, or a monism of being, whatever the form of the being may be conceived to be, does not explain the world of our experience, and leaves no provision for morality and religion.

And as Jesus himself is one with the Father, so likewise, he says, shall the disciples become one with God. He prays: "Father . . . that they may be one even as we are one." And "even as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee; that they also may be in us." And the ground of this larger oneness is the same as that of Christ's own oneness with God. It, too, is ethical, for it all depends upon this: "If ye keep my commandments . . . as I have kept my Father's commandments." Dr. William Adams Brown, in his book on *Christian Theology in Outline*, says: "It is not that in Jesus we have the manifestation for a brief time of the powers and relations normally absent from human life; but that in him for the first time there has been completely revealed in human life that abiding relation between God and man which gives life its profoundest significance and warrants our faith in the ultimate realization of the divine ideal in humanity." It is the faith of this type of theism that God will ultimately realize himself in humanity as He did in Jesus of Nazareth,—not soon,—perhaps only after myriads of centuries; and perhaps not in every individual, but in the genus man, and in the majority of men. And this world of perfect moral oneness, of the union of all rational wills, I believe is a world infinitely more to be desired than the world of any other system of philosophy or religion.

It is just at this point where pantheistic philosophies sacrifice the finite personality. At the point where God, the universal soul, realizes himself in the individual, the individual merges again into the universal. There is a fusion of the personalities, or an absorption of the individual by the universal. Our type of theism, as we have seen, saves itself at this vital point for pure practical reasons. But it is again in perfect agreement with the teaching of Jesus. Jesus himself claims to retain his personality while he becomes one with God. To deny this is clearly to misunderstand his teachings. And, likewise, the disciples will retain their distinct individuality while they become one with Jesus, and through him one with God. Neither does death mean extinction of the individual as

an individual, or absorption into the absolute. Jesus died, and as he claimed, went back to the Father. But this was not identical with being reabsorbed into God. Jesus remains Jesus, and claims to continue his personal relation with his followers. The retention of this personal identity in the union with God is a promise given to the disciples. It is here where that infinite perspective, allowing infinite progress in goodness, which is the greatest encouragement to moral effort, of which we spoke in the preceding section, is presented in the clearest light in any system of thought or religion that has been offered for our consideration. This hope of the monism of all wills, infinite and finite, of the oneness of all rational desires and love, without the sacrifice of personality, I believe to be the loftiest goal to which mankind can aspire. Toward this goal we believe the world is moving, with almost imperceptibly small strides, not always in a straight line, and with many a groan.

To sum up: in the *Weltanschauung* of philosophic theism God is viewed as a self-conscious, personal being, who is the immanent and animating principle of all things. He is immanent in the world as the world's natural and spiritual laws, yet morally transcending the world as the goal toward which all things move. The material world is real for our experience, and the necessary medium through which spirit reveals and actualizes itself. In the realm of the phenomenal, law reigns supreme. Causation is the key-principle that unlocks the universe to our understanding absolutely everywhere save in the narrow but tremendously important realm of the will which gives a law to itself and, therefore, determines its own moral position in this otherwise determined universe. The goal of the world is viewed as moral, the triumph of rationality, the moral harmony or monism of all rational wills. This world-view of modern philosophic theism I sincerely believe to be the most satisfactory one that has been offered from the materialistic monism of the ancient Parmenides on down to the pantheism of Paulsen and the absolutism of Royce. It satisfies the head

and the heart of man, both the claims of reason and the needs of life as no other system does.

As theologians we should thank the philosopher for putting these theistic tenets to a fearless and rigid test. We are glad that he has weighed them in the balances of an impartial criticism and has not found them wanting. We can believe them with renewed confidence, and preach them and teach them with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

II.

THE CHARM OF ENGLISH PROSE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.¹

SAMUEL MCCHORD CROTHERS.

Tennyson tells us how Sir Percivale turned

From noiseful arms and acts of prowess done
In tournament and tilt

and in an abbey far from Camelot

Beneath a world-old yew tree, darkening half
The cloisters on a gustful April morn

talked with the monk Ambrosius about the events of the past.

In thus changing the subject from current events, Sir Percivale showed a pardonable weakness.

In the same way I venture to leave the contemporary world, the noiseful arms and acts of prowess done by twentieth century captains of industry or social reformers, assured conservatives or eager progressives, and spend an hour in another age. I shall take as my theme—"The Charm of English Prose in the Seventeenth Century."

We may go back to that generation in which English Prose attained to an unusual strength and beauty.

Prose—the very word is a warning. Is not prosaic an adjective of reproach. Poetry has charm, at least in the eyes of

¹ The Phi Beta Kappa oration delivered at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., on the tenth of June, 1914, by the Rev. Samuel McChord Crothers, D.D., Litt. D., of Cambridge, Mass.

its producers, else it would never come into existence. But prose is the Cinderella of literature, and must mind the pots and kettles while her proud sisters are at the ball. Prose, homely and unadorned, is the drudge of all work. Prose is what we write when we can write nothing else. But now and then the fairy god-mother appears, and Cinderella has her fling. She has, for a little time, "beauty for ashes, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness"

Just as there are periods when genius takes a lyric or dramatic form, so there are periods when it expresses itself in narrative or even didactic prose.

The sixteenth century was an age favorable to poetry. Its spirit was one of romantic expectation. All sorts of dazzling possibilities opened up to the excited imagination. Men found the ordinary speech inadequate.

Stout Sir Thomas Stuckley of Ilfracombe, when he talked with Queen Elizabeth about the commercial possibilities of Florida, began to rhapsodize. He would rather be the head of a plantation in Florida than linger in any of the courts of Europe. "I hope," said the Queen, "I may hear from you when you are stated in your principality."

"I will write unto you," quoth Stuckley.

"In what language?" said the Queen.

"In the language of princes," said Stuckley, "to our dear sister."

When merchant adventurers adopted the style of princes, they would prefer the *Faerie Queene* to any prosaic text-book on ethics. There was the exhilaration which comes when great revolutionary ideas are in the air, which have not yet been reduced to inconvenient action. Young men dreamed dreams and old men saw visions, and left the next generation to pay the bills. When the spacious times of great Elizabeth had passed into history the bills for the sixteenth century improvements in civilization became due. The theory of civil and religious liberty had been adopted, but now the practical conse-

quences must be considered. Who was to pay for the new freedom?

Now, when men begin to talk about ways and means to make both ends meet they are more apt to use prose than poetry. They are likely also to lose their tempers. After the triumph of Protestantism in England there came the period of internal strife—Parliament against the King, Churchman against Puritan and both against that “world-hating and world-hated beast”—the haggard Anabaptist. Law-abiding citizens were appalled at the new broods of anarchists. Whether they were called Ranters, or Quakers or Root-and-Branch men or Fifth Monarchy men, they pestered quiet people, and interfered with business. They perpetrated the social unrest. There is one phrase which continually occurs, as giving the impression of thoughtful persons as to their own age. These are “distracted rimes”—times of the letting loose of destructive energies and of hysterical passion. The terrors of the French Revolution have obscured for us the disorders and fanaticisms of the great revolutionary period of England when churches were ruined, property rights ignored, churches desecrated, works of art destroyed, clergy deprived of their livings, the hereditary aristocracy degraded from its place of power, the constitution overthrown, and the anointed King tried and executed as a traitor. To those of conservative tendencies who were living in the period, and did not know how it would come out, it was terrifying enough. It was this period of unrest with its fierce contentions over practical matters that produced some of the most forceful English prose. It was the age which gave the final literary impress to the English Bible. It was the period of Izaak Walton, of Thomas Fuller, of George Herbert, of Jeremy Taylor, of John Milton, of John Bunyan.

If I were to indicate the chief characteristic of the writers of this period I should say it was their ability to give an uncommon expression to common sense. Now while in practical life common sense is esteemed as a virtue, in the arts it is often, with justice, considered to be the sum of all villainies.

For it is taken as another name for the irremediably commonplace.

Horace Walpole tells us how one day he met Hogarth, who insisted on talking to him about his *History of Painting*. Hogarth wished to apologize for English painting. He ended with a remark which amused Walpole: "The reason why we English do not paint better is because we have too much common sense." It was before the Cubists and Futurists had been dreamed of, and Hogarth could not have imagined to what heights painting could soar when the inhibitions of common sense were altogether removed.

But the criticism is suggestive. Poetry suffers from too much common sense. Its wings are clipped and it cannot soar. Music is of the same nature. Grand opera would be impossible if the tenor in expressing his affection for his lady-love were to ignore the conventions of his art and take counsel of his common sense. But prose does not need to soar. It is pedestrian in its habit. It is at its best when its feet are on the ground. There is no fine frenzy about it, and it insists on following the rule of reason.

But with his feet upon the solid earth a man may shuffle along or he may dawdle, or limp or walk mincingly. Or, on the other hand, he may walk with a firm, confident stride, as one who knows where he is going and who is glad of the wholesome exercise. Such a pedestrian would not exchange a stout pair of legs for the ordinary kind of wings. So there is a kind of prose which in power to stir the imagination is surpassed only by the best kinds of poetry. The characteristic of the great prose writers of the seventeenth century was huge, heroic common sense. It was the common sense of middle-aged gentlemen, not in slippered ease, but in fighting trim, and carrying the least possible amount of adipose tissue.

Usually common sense arrives at the period when the spirit of adventure is dead. It takes the form of good-humored cynicism. The prudential virtues are treated as the residuum when the tumults of youth have subsided. So in the gulches

of the far West, below the site of some old mining camp where the gambling spirit ruled, you may see the patient, unemotional Chinaman working over the tailings. He gets a sufficient living out of what, in the wasteful days, ran away through the sluices.

There is a kind that is different from this. It is active not passive. It is a quality which belongs to practitioners of preventive medicine for the body politic.

“Think not that Prudence dwells in dark abodes. She scans the future with the eye of gods.” The ideal is that of one who in Miltonic phrase is “a skilful considerer of human things.”

Amid the tumults and fanaticisms of the seventeenth century there arose an unusual number of skilful considerers of human things. Some of them were conservatives, some were radicals, some fought for the King, some for the Parliament, but they had certain qualities in common. Theirs was the large utterance of men who were dealing with great questions. They had no time for hair-splitting. There was a manly grasp of principles and an acceptance of responsibilities, as of those to whom words and deeds were inseparable. They were all the time dealing with conduct. Men took up the pen as they would take up the sword, for a cause they heartily believed in. How far from the temper which we are accustomed to call *literary* is Milton’s description of the way a man fits himself for authorship.

“When a man writes to the world he summons up all his reason and deliberation to assist him, he searches, meditates, is industrious, and likely consults and confers with his judicious friends, after all which done he takes himself to be informed in what he writes as any that writ before him.” This is “the most consummate act of his fidelity and ripeness.”

In that age of exuberant pamphleteering not all that was written and printed would stand that test—certainly not all that Milton wrote. But there was a distinct note of disciplined courage. It is common sense transfigured and courageous. There is a rare charm of personality. Milton has it. So has

Jeremy Taylor; so has John Bunyan and George Fox. "Softness," wrote Bishop Taylor, "is for slaves, for minstrels, for the fair ox."

The same sense of disciplined courage which was the note in England was felt in New England. A great part of the fame of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonists comes from the fact that they were their own historians and realized the ideal significance of their own doings. No orator on Forefathers' Day can do better than take his text from some great utterance of Governor Bradford: "They had a great hope and inward zeal of laying some good foundation." The whole story of the men of the *Mayflower*, their inner and their outward lives, is in that pregnant sentence. We read it as Holy Writ, and the history of freedom in America is the commentary.

Or we linger over that other text, which follows the list of discouragements to the new undertakings: "It was answered that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties and must be both enterprised and overcome by answerable courages."

Even in the narrative of the most ordinary event there is an arresting quality. Governor Winthrop had been guilty of the indiscretion of moving his house from Cambridge. For this he was called to account by the fiery Dudley. But how admirable is the description of the quarrel that ensued.

"The deputy began to be in a passion and told the Governor that if he were so round, he would be round also. So the deputy rose in a great fury and passion, and the Governor grew very hot also. And they both fell into a fury of bitterness. But by the mediation of the mediators they were soon pacified. . . . So the meeting breaking up without any other consideration but the commending of the success of it by prayer to the Lord, the Governor brought the deputy onward of his way, and every man went to his own home."

That is only a straightforward narrative of one of the commonest incidents of local politics. Yet it is told in such a way that it is invested with an atmosphere of moral dignity. They

were angry and sinned not at least against the canons of literature. There was a peculiar flavor to the speech of the men of that period which we recognize in their most casual talk. We listen to the remark of King James I. at the dinner table: "He must have been a very valiant man who first adventured upon the eating of an oyster." We have all had that thought, but we could not express it in that way.

The fact is that the men of that generation had a great advantage over us in the material with which they worked. The builder in concrete construction is careful in his specifications to demand not only a good quality of Portland cement, but also a sufficiency of sharp sand. Not only must there be something that binds, but there must be material that can be bound.

So in our speech. There is a fluency, not to say fluidity, in our present language which makes for easy writing, but does not produce structural strength. The sentence is flowing, or at best a sticky mass that does not "set." The words themselves are not clean and sharp. They have no edge. Words that have been used in so many senses that their original significance has been forgotten come at length to form only a verbal quick-sand.

The older writers had at their command an abundance of clean sharp words. It mattered little whether the words were Anglo-Saxon or Latin in their origin. The important thing was that their primary meanings were in the minds of both speakers and listeners.

The word and the thing had not analogy but identity of meaning. It was said of Sir Walter Raleigh—"He seemed to be born to be only that he went about." When such men spoke their words fitted their mood. Their utterance was individual. They put themselves into it as they did into their sword thrusts.

Let us compare two forms of speech. Here is a sentence from an excellent novel: "As he went down stairs he halted at the landing, his hand going to his forehead, a reflex motion

significant of a final attempt to achieve the hitherto unattainable feat of imagining her to be his wife."

There is something self-conscious in this sentence. The accepted lover is a bundle of hesitancies. In the attempt to psychologize we are in doubt whether he will get down stairs. We certainly do not see him do it. There is nothing suggested but a series of reflex actions which will in all probability come to nothing.

We find ourselves murmuring: If the fond lover thinks he loves, or the loved thinks she is loved, they are probably both mistaken.

Now turn to Izaak Walton. "My honest scholar it is now past five of the clock. We will fish till nine and then go to breakfast. Go you to yonder sycamore tree and hide your bottle of drink under the hollow root of it, for about that time and in that place we will make a brave breakfast with a piece of powdered beef and a radish or two. We shall, I warrant you, make a good, honest, wholesome, hungry breakfast. And then I will give you direction for the making and using of your flies."

What is the difference? There is a difference, not only in the arrangement of the sentences, but in the nature of the words. In one case the words are listless and indifferent. They look as if they had been up late at night and had lost interest in life. They are self-conscious, as if they had just come out of the psychology book and were sorry that they had left it.

In the other case the words have the dew of the morning upon them. They are brisk and cheery. They stand erect and look you in the eye. They are glad to be alive. It is only a piece of dried beef and a radish or two that is promised, but it is a brave breakfast, a good, honest, wholesome, hungry breakfast. We are sure of that. The very words make us hungry.

There are a great many ways of putting things and they all may be equally grammatical. Suppose that I wish to express the idea that the Bible is worthy of careful study. There are

many parts of it that may appear uninteresting to the superficial reader which contain ideas of great importance to those who have industry and spiritual perception to discover them. If that is what I want to say, that is about the way I should say it, unless I were talking to theological students and then I should bring in the word exegesis. This is the way a seventeenth century preacher says it: "Where the surface of scripture doth not laugh with corn, the heart thereof within is merry with wines."

It's only a way of putting things, a mere trick of language, do you say. But language is not a trick, it is an expression of personality. Find out a man's natural and habitual way of expressing himself and you find out a great deal about the man. We talk about expressing a thought in different language, but are you sure that in your paraphrase you have expressed all the thought—or if the thought have you also expressed the feeling.

In the card catalogue of the Boston Library there is the title of a book published about a hundred years ago. It is "An attempt to translate the prophetic parts of the Apocalypse of St. John into familiar language, by divesting it of the metaphors in which it is involved." My curiosity was not sufficient to lead me to take out the book but I should imagine that it would not be very much like the Apocalypse.

The attempt to treat literary style apart from the personality of which it is the expression leads us unto those regions of scholarship which belong to the permanently arid belt. However keen the analysis it does not reveal the secret of charm or of force.

The true lover of literature is discovered by the simple test which King Solomon found so efficacious when the two women claimed each for herself the living child. The critic with Solomonic gravity, lifts his sword to cleave in sunder the living work of genius. "I will divide the word from the thought. I will give to one the literary form and to the other the actual meaning of this passage." Then the literal-minded student of literature says: "Divide it." But the loving reader cries:

"Not so, my Lord, give her the living child, and in no wise slay it."

It, of course, all depends on the kind of literature which we have in mind, whether it is the kind that lives, or is the kind that is merely put together.

Bergson, in his *Creative Evolution*, points out the difference between a vital process and a manufacture. The manufacturer finds in his product exactly what he put into it. The pieces are put together and form a complete whole. But life has an explosive quality about it, and each bit into which it explodes has power to reproduce itself, and is influenced by a new set of circumstances. Therefore, "Life in evolving sows itself in an unforeseeable variety of form."

Now the same thing is true in literary history. There are writers who are careful craftsmen. Their manufactured works are admirably done. They use words which express their thoughts with absolute precision. It is a case where we find precisely what the manufacturer put into it.

And yet, though we read and admired them, we find it difficult to remember them. The reason of this is that we are very self-centered creatures, and we can't remember what other people have thought nearly so well as we can what we have been thinking ourselves.

It is here that real genius for expression comes in. Some one, in an unforgettable sentence, drops a thought into our mind. Henceforth it is not his but ours. He was but the sower going forth to sow; but our minds form the field, and the harvest is ours. There are books which have this germinating power. No matter what the original writer thought, their great value is in what they cause us to think. "Words that are simple," said the Chinese Sage, "but whose meanings are far reaching are good words." There are inner meanings, suggestions and universal applications. The Christian apostle urges us to "provoke one another to good works." So there are books which do not so much provide us with thoughts as provoke us to good thinking. In such provocation the form is essential.

Of this provocative quality the Bible is the supreme example. But even the Bible with its stimulating thought has gained immensely in its power over English-speaking people from the fact that it was translated at a time when the language was peculiarly vital, and its words had not lost their explosive power.

In scripture texts it is very difficult to change the language without a sense of impoverishment. Any one can test this for himself by comparing the King James' version with the so-called twentieth century version, whose translators state their principle to be to "exclude all words and phrases not used in current English."

Read the story of the Nativity: "When Herod the King heard it he was troubled and all Jerusalem with him."

This is the simplest form of narrative, but it is vital. Read it in any time of popular commotion, and vague unrest. How the words come back as we see the troubled rulers and the troubled city. It is a text which has been used in every great civic crisis since the days of King Herod.

But suppose the preacher were compelled to take his text from the twentieth century version:

"When King Herod heard the news he was much troubled and his anxiety was shared by the whole of Jerusalem."

Even the person least sensitive to literary charm must feel that something had happened to the text.

"A city set upon a hill cannot be hid." These words suggest something. They kindle thought. The twentieth century version reads: "It is impossible for a town that stands on a hill to escape notice." These words are a verbal wet blanket.

One cannot speak of the charm of seventeenth century prose without touching upon its humor. In Milton it was conspicuously absent, as it was with most of the men of the Puritan party, with the great exception of Bunyan. It was, however, the solace of the honest gentlemen of the conservative party—and they needed it. Jolted over abominable roads, at a pace that was unpleasing to them, it was fortunate that their minds

were fitted with a shock absorber. To them literature was a consolation in times when politics was a nightmare. Thomas Fuller voiced their moods in his sequence of pleasant homilies—*Good Thoughts in Bad Times*. A few years after he published *Good Thoughts in Worse Times*, and then *Mixed Contemplations in Better Times*.

Dear to the soul of Charles Lamb was the humor of Fuller. Says Lamb, Fuller's "way of telling a story, for its eager liveliness and the perpetual running commentary of the narrator happily blended with the narration is perhaps unequalled." Many have undertaken, as did Lamb himself, to make collections of the *Wit and Humor* of Thomas Fuller. But these excerpts do not do justice to one whom Coleridge declares "was incomparably, the most sensible, the least prejudiced great man of an age that boasted a galaxy of great men."

Fuller's humor was the quintessence of common sense. A clergyman of the Church of England, and a royalist by conviction, he was also a man of liberal principles and a believer in reforms. He was also a scholar and deeply interested in antiquities. He saw no reason why Churchmen and Puritans should not work together in brotherly fashion, and why King and Parliament should not come to terms. He looked upon the different varieties of opinion as natural. There was room for all parties, if they would only behave themselves. But that was the very thing they wouldn't do. That was the humor of it. He as a man of peace must take hard blows from all sides. That is the lot of the peace-maker. But Fuller did not mind a little thing like that.

Events were too strong for him. "Many things in England are out of joint for the present and a strange confusion there is in church and state, but let this comfort us that it is a confusion in tendency to order."

Had Fuller been a professor of history sitting in his study two hundred years after the events he could not have better summed up the general situation.

Having come to this philosophical conclusion concerning the

times Fuller proceeded to make the best of them. That things would work out in the end for some kind of order he had no doubt. Just how they would work out he did not pretend to know.

"There dwelt not long since a devout but ignorant Papist in Spain. Every morning, bending his knees and lifting his eyes to heaven, he would repeat the alphabet. And now, he said 'O good God, put these letters together to spell syllables and to make such sense as may be to thy glory and my good.' . . . In these distracted times I fall to the poor pious man's prayer—A, B, C, D," etc.

As to the zealous cries for more liberty, he says that he thinks the age is sufficiently provided with that commodity. "It were liberty enough if, for the next seven years, all sermons were obliged to keep residence on the text—'Love one another.' . . . Too many nowadays are like Pharaoh's magicians who could conjure up with their charms more new frogs, but could not drive away the frogs that were there before."

Turn from the pamphlets of the day with their fierce invective to Fuller's little homily on the psalms.

"Sometimes I have disputed with myself which was the most guilty, David who said in his haste, all men are liars, or that wicked man who sat and spoke against his brother and slandered his mother's son. David seems the greater offender, for mankind might have an action of defamation against him, yea he might be challenged for giving all men the lie. But mark: David was in haste, he spoke as it were *in transitu*, when he was passing, or rather posting by; or if you please it was not David, but David's haste that rashly vented the words. Whereas the other *sat*, a solemn, serious, premeditate posture. Now to say he sat carries with it the countenance of a judicial proceeding, as if he made a session or bench business thereof."

"Lord pardon my cursory and preserve me from sedentary sins." But though he was averse to the sedentary sins of acrimonious recrimination, he believed in holy wrath and

writes admiringly of that excellent clergyman, William Perkins—"He could pronounce the word damn with such an emphasis as left a doleful echo in the hearer's mind a good while after."

It was in the midst of civil distractions when he himself was driven from pillar to post that Fuller wrote the *Worthies of England* and the *Church History of Britain*—books which along with Walton's *Compleat Angler* are potent charms against the foul fiends Hurry and Worry. They diffuse around the reader a soothing atmosphere of unlimited leisure.

We are rambling over the country from one hospitable mansion to another, in the company of a gentleman who knows everybody and has all the time in the world to tell us about them. He has the knack of hitting always upon some little peculiarity in his worthies which makes us remember them.

As for his *Church History*, it was written as no church history has been written before or since. Whether one likes it or not depends on whether he likes Fuller.

In the report of a recent conference of historians we are told of the progress that has been made "since history ceased to be a pleasant branch of literature and became the serious pursuit of eager specialists." I am sure that eager specialists would not approve of Fuller's *Church History of Britain*, with its leisurely rambling through the centuries, stopping at gentlemen's houses to study the coats of arms, and sometimes for many pages forgetting all about the church in talking about something more interesting. It was written at a time when Fuller was moving precariously from one royalist gentleman's house to another, and so he conceived the ingenious device of dedicating each chapter to a different patron. The reader finds his progress down the ages interrupted by these pleasant discourses about the domestic virtues of Fuller's many friends. When the chapter is dedicated, as sometimes happens, to the younger members of the family, there is more or less talk about the best ways of bringing them up.

Nevertheless, I hold in spite of the eager specialists that

even when history is recognized as a science, there will also be a place for the kind of history that is a pleasant branch of literature. Says Fuller to the reader:

“We read of King Ahasuerus that, having his head troubled with much business, and finding himself so indisposed that he could not sleep, he caused the records to be called for and read unto him; hoping thereby to deceive the tediousness of the time, and that the pleasant passages in the chronicles would either invite slumber, or enable him to endure waking with less molestation. We live in a troublesome and tumultuous age, and he needs to have a soft bed who can sleep soundly nowadays, amidst so much loud noise and many impetuous rumors. Wherefore it seemeth to me to be both a safe and cheap receipt to procure quiet and repose to the mind which complains of want of rest to prescribe to it the reading of history. Great is the pleasure and the profit thereof.”

Whatever we may think of the King Ahasuerus theory in general, I think it is a safe and cheap prescription for one with much business in the twentieth century, to escape now and then and enjoy the companionship of men of another age. This is not to say that the former times were better than these, it is only to say that they were different. And a change of climate now and then is good for one's intellectual health. It is said of Burton the author of *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, that when settled as rector in a beautiful English village he often tired of the conversation of his excellent parishioners. The melancholy which he so admirably anatomized possessed him as he went his parish rounds. But on summer afternoons he would make his way to the river bank, and hiding himself behind an ancient tree he would listen delightedly to the rough but idiomatic talk of the bargemen. His parishioners would see the parson returning with a smile upon his face, and much refreshed. Such refreshment comes when we slip away and listen to the unspoiled speech of a former generation.

Every age has its literary fashions, and the critics who sit in high places tell us what we must admire. Just at the present time the fashions are somewhat difficult. It is the fashion

to exalt the instinctive above the rational. There are clever young writers who insist on harrowing our souls of persons whose life consists in vague yearnings for a return to the wild or the nude, or any of the things from which mankind is emerging. They treat primitive instincts as if they were just invented, the very latest things out, and the moral law as a quaint survival of the early Victorian period. It is only a passing fashion.

But the reader need not be tyrannized over by any fashion whatever. He is free of the world. If he doesn't like what is set before him he can go elsewhere. It is a case where the ultimate consumer can snap his fingers at the producer and the middleman. When he is persecuted in one century he can flee to another.

To those who have troubles enough of their own, to make them value literature as a means of reinvigoration, the seventeenth century may be recommended as a health resort. There may be found good air and good exercise, in the companionship of men of robust intelligence. They had their faults, but they never mistook neurasthenia for genius.

It is a literature produced not by specialists for specialists, but by men of action who were also men of thought, men of whom it could be said of Sir Henry Walton—he did ever love to join with business study and the trial of natural experiments.

Here one may meet good fighters with language capable of hard blows. "Let them know," said Milton to the recalcitrant Presbytery of Belfast. "Let them know that sincere and right intention can with as much ease deliver themselves into words as into deeds."

Here may be found honest gentlemen who knew how to be good losers, and who, when the currents of public affairs went against them, could retire to the banks of the streams.

"Every misery that I miss is a new mercy. Nay let me tell you that there be many that have forty times our estates that would give the greatest part of it to be healthful and cheerful like us, who with the expense of a little money have eat and drunk and laughed and angled, and sung and slept securely,

and rose next day and cast away care and laughed and angled again."

Or we may sit at table with Selden and hear him discourse wisely and wittily about the constitution and the laws. Or we may sit with the wise physician, Sir Thomas Browne, and hear him discourse about religion: "I thank God with joy, I was never afraid of hell, nor grew pale at the mention of that place. I fear God, yet I am not afraid of him. I can hardly think any one was scared into heaven. They go the fairest way to heaven that would serve God without a hell."

Not so did John Bunyan feel. He was horribly afraid of hell. But what of it. Mr. Honest trudges on the difficult road. He has an honest fear but he has an honest courage also. And on the road when he is hungry he can eat as brave a breakfast as any angler of them all.

"How fares it in your pilgrimage asks Mr. Contrite, and Mr. Honest answers cheerily:

"It happens to us as it happeneth to wayfaring men sometimes our way is clean, sometimes foul, sometimes up hill, sometimes down, we are seldom at a certainty, the wind is not always at our backs, nor is every one a friend that we meet on the way. We have met with some notable rubs already, and what is yet beyond we know not, but for the most part we find it true that has been talked of old, a good man must suffer trouble."

As we listen we agree with Mr. Greatheart as he cries: "Well said, Father Honest, by this I know thou art a cock of the right kind, for thou hast said the truth."

Whatever their politics or religion we feel that these were men of the kind and we are glad that they wrote books.

And if it should happen that there should be a strike among our living writers, and no new books should be published for a year and a day we should not be afraid. With these honest gentlemen we should in Bunyan's phrase, "make a pretty good shift to wag along."

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

III.

BERGSON'S CREATIVE EVOLUTION—AN ESTIMATE.¹

R. C. SCHIEDT.

In a former article I endeavored to set forth Bergson's views on the evolution of the universe "sine ira et studio," but promised to contrast it in a second article with modern biological thinking and the Christian faith. I might say at the outset that Bergson has not added one iota to scientific knowledge, nor has he illuminated the Christian idea of God and his relation to man and the universe. For, according to the accepted Christian theology the life of the universe is the *effect* not the *unfolding* of the divine life, the life of the finite is substantially different from the divine life. According to Bergson God is not perfected, absolute spiritual reality but the unceasing, constantly unfolding life, activity, freedom of the universe. He recognizes no transcendental, supernatural reality which would justify and give value to the natural as the great master of metaphysics Immanuel Kant does. Like Nietzsche he stops at the mere will to live, he cannot distinguish between high and low, good and evil, but considers all reality, because it is real, and all life, because it is living, to be the absolute and divine.

Modern biological thinking as represented by the Darwinians and the Neo-Lamarckians is completely at issue with Bergson while the Neo-Vitalists, particularly Driesch and his disciples, hail him as the only one who succeeded—metaphysically at least—in unifying the evolutionary problem. It is perhaps unfair and odious to call Bergson before the bar of the biological Sanhedrim because of the fundamental differ-

¹ See article on "Creative Evolution" in this REVIEW, April, 1914.

ences of the two. The former deals with remote causes, the latter with proximate causes, the one with first principles and motive forces as such, the others with the precise manner in which the forces work. To Bergson it is the vital impetus, the great original indefinable motive force, dividing into many branches, which is the fundamental cause of variations that accumulate and create new species, to the Darwinians the essential causes of variation are the purely accidental and individual differences inherent in the germ, while according to the Lamarckians additional acquired characteristics of the soma influence the process. A simple illustration will make the difference clear. If Mr. Bergson would describe the evolution of linoleum he would discuss the steam pressure in the boiler as the moving force, forming a force-river which was subdivided into streams and rivulets of force branching in every direction, and flooding inert matter until linoleum was evolved. He would call that a precise explanation. The Darwinist, on the other hand, would describe the boiling of linseed oil, the preparation of cork and burlap, the building up of patterns and the final work of the press, without saying a word about the motive force. It stands to reason that the man in the street would get a clearer idea of linoleum from the latter explanation than from the former, but there are after all deeper problems involved in the whole process, which lie beyond the horizon of the man in the street. These, Bergson claims, cannot be solved by the scientist who is primarily a technician but must be solved by the philosopher. The Darwinians seriously object to these claims and charge the French savant with a misapprehension of the mission of metaphysics as well as of science.

Bergson admits that the causes of variation are differences inherent in the germ and not due to the inheritance of acquired characteristics. He is so far forth a Darwinian and not a Lamarckian. However, he denies that the differences are purely accidental and individual, but insists that they are the development of an impulsion appearing at the same time, in the same form in all or at least in a certain number of the same

species, as indeed DeVries's theory of mutations seems to intimate. In fact DeVries asserts on the basis of direct observation that at a given moment after a long period the entire species is beset with a tendency to change. The *tendency* to change is therefore not accidental, although the change itself would be, since the mutation works in different directions in the different representatives of the species. Now the Darwinians claim that such changes come by pure chance, *e. g.*, by the stimulation of certain latent germ characteristics through some new food element, physical or chemical, the Neo-Lamarckians attribute it to some psychological cause such as the conscious effort of the individual, but Bergson rejects all these explanations on the ground that a hereditary change in a definite direction must be related to an effort of far greater depth than the individual effort, far more independent of circumstances, an effort common to most representatives of the same species, inherent in the germs they bear rather than in their substance alone, an effort thereby assured of being passed on to their descendants, otherwise a great many strange phenomena such as the near identity of the structure of the eye in widely different phyla would be unexplainable. Back of these theories, he claims there is a reality of which they only take a partial view, but which transcends them and unites them all and this reality is the special object of philosophy which is not constrained to scientific precision, because it contemplates no practical application.

Bergson, however, admits that certain minor instincts and even some primary ones may be accounted for on Darwin's mechanistic hypothesis of accidental variation. The Darwinians reply that there is no difference between minor and major, simple or complex from the point of view of ease and difficulty of evolution. The question is merely one of time; the one will require more time than the other. It is granted that in a certain time a simple adaptation can be evolved by the addition of accidental variations, then given more time the hypothesis will account for the most complex. The only possible method of refutation is to limit the time. But Darwin always speaks of

small but profitable variations saying expressly that if ever a non-profitable variation could be shown to have been selected, his theory would fall to the ground. This was done by Nägeli, the botanist. He has long ago pointed out that we must distinguish between characteristics of adaptation and morphological characteristics, to the former belong the organs of locomotion, such as wings, fins and limbs, to the latter the variety of the reproductive organs. He maintains variation by selection can only be shown for the former but not for the latter, but it is the latter which are of greatest value for the classification particularly of plants into genera, families, orders and classes. Darwin claims that a variation is the more readily displaced by selection the less useful it is. But in the plant world the most constant characters are the morphological ones which are of no use in the struggle for existence, while the theory of selection insists that only the most useful are the most constant. Nägeli, therefore, says that a purely accidental variation could never form new species or genera, but at the best only subordinate varieties. Similar objections have been raised by a host of other biologists, among them Sachs, Askenasy, Wolf and even Herbert Spencer. But all these men were upholders of the mechanistic theory of evolution, only, their specific explanations differed. They would in no wise accept Bergson's metaphysical theory.

A second objection of the French savant to Darwin's method of selection is the inability to account for parallel development in unrelated organisms, as *e. g.*, similar eyes in a mollusc (the Pecten) and in man. The Pecten is closely related to the oyster and the clam, both of which have no distinctive organ of vision, in fact the Pecten is the only genus in the whole class of Lamellibranch Molluscs which possesses a perfect eye consisting of retina, cornea and a lens of cellular structure just as the human eye, only they have been produced from tissues which are not in the least homologous. "How could the same variations," Bergson asks, "incalculable in number, have ever occurred in the same order on two independent lines of

evolution, if they were purely accidental? That two walkers starting from different points and wandering at random should finally meet is no great wonder. But that throughout their walk they should describe two identical curves exactly superposable on one another is altogether unlikely." Again the Darwinians reply: the steps of evolution are not taken at random but most severely regulated by natural selection and the struggle for existence. On any theory we must suppose that the improved eye was a necessity or a great advantage to the Pecten, and although the latter's eye and our eye do not aim at and do not arrive at the same goal nor do they arrive by the same path, if the improvement was within the scope of natural selection—as its existence in the vertebrate type proves—natural selection would compass it in time in another. The laws of optics and the general uniformity of fully developed eyes point to a retina, a cornea and a lens as the only solution. The Pecten must therefore either solve the problem in this way or go without the eye. Consequently, if adjustment is demanded by the struggle and there is only one way of bringing it about, then nature will repeat itself in the most unrelated types, always on condition that unlimited time is given her. If, on the contrary there are many solutions open, then the diversity will be as remarkable in that case as the uniformity in this, as instance the many solutions by orchids of the one problem of fertilization by insects. Bergson cannot admit, that while a change in the germ which influences the formation of the retina may affect at the same time by the law of correlation also the formation of the cornea, the iris, the lens, the visual centers, etc., it should occur in such a way as to improve or evenly maintain vision, unless *a mysterious principle* is to come in whose duty it is to watch over the interest of the function. But this would rule out accidental variation. To most minds there is a good deal of linguistic nebulosity on both sides of the argument. Is there after all much difference between the statements "nature selects" and "a mysterious power or principle controls"? Let us see. As a matter of fact Darwin uses the

word "chance" only in a restricted sense, not excluding causality or necessity. If I pass by a house at the moment a slate falls from the roof it is pure chance, whether the slate strikes me or not. As to the slate the falling is not chance but necessity, due to a definite cause, but it is chance that I happen to pass by just at that moment. An accident or chance in the Darwinian sense is an occurrence which coincides with another occurrence with which it has no causal connection. Chance, therefore, plays a role in nature, just as necessity or causality, but an accidental occurrence is the direct opposite of a lawful occurrence for the latter always repeat themselves in the same way, the former rarely or never. Shall we then assume that Bergson's mysterious power would exclude all chance or accidental variation? Surely not. As a matter of fact variation, the foundation of the whole evolutionary hypothesis, is only apparently something simple, in reality it is the result of extremely complicated processes, the causal relations of which are still completely hidden to us and perhaps will remain forever hidden. However, granted the reasonableness of variation in principle, we must not forget that the whole system of selection is based upon the assumption that it started with very simple organisms into which the creator, as Darwin himself says, breathed life. With this statement the great naturalist confessed that after all back of all secondary causes there was a primary cause, which to him was more definite than a mysterious power, a creative personality, which endowed matter with definite laws that controlled all subsequent development. Darwin's theory is therefore not mechanistic in the strict sense of the word. The chief difference, however, between Bergson's mysterious power or "élan vitale" and Darwin's "blind natural law" lies in the different conception of design as expressed on the one hand by the organization of plants and animals and on the other by the manufacture of human tools and machines. What Darwin means by "blind natural law" is best illustrated by a homely example. We witness at present a constant improvement or selection in the manufacture of bicycles and automobiles. The

old clumsy models have been eliminated through the struggle for existence which arose when newer models, better adapted to modern needs, appeared in the market, and this elimination is a continuous one. All such apparatuses tend in their development towards an equilibrium, *i. e.*, the most perfect adaptation to the needs which they must satisfy. This process, however, is not the work of conscious design—although the intelligence of the mechanical inventors is involved in the competition—but it is a process of selection through which the less useful is suppressed spontaneously. The mysterious power of Bergson would in this case shape matters so that the best facilities for riding are obtained. If we apply this to the case of the eyes in question, we would interpret the Darwinian position by saying “because the Pecten and man have equally perfect eyes they can see equally well” and the Bergsonian by the statement: “Pecten and man have equally perfect eyes, in order to see equally well.” The latter is more in harmony with Nägeli’s directive variation. It also is more in harmony with Lamarck’s theory of individual effort and in accord with the Neo-Lamarckian School so prevalent in the United States. The logical effect of Darwin’s position or rather of the position of his radical disciples is to make it forever henceforth unnecessary to presuppose the action of mind in nature and thus they exhibit the working of nature as automatic.

However, if Bergson’s vital impetus or mysterious power were identical with the cosmic intelligence, he would have given us nothing new. Edward von Hartmann has discussed this hypothesis, which is an old one, most fully and brilliantly in his noted book on *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*. I believe I can make my point clearer by referring briefly to Hartmann’s ideas, as they are presented by Reinke, the eminent botanist, and his school. Just as the human reason is the transcendent cause to which an engine owes its existence and construction, so also is the cosmic reason the transcendent cause of organisms, the latter is different from but analogous to human intelligence. This cosmic reason, according to Hartmann and

his school, is not an illusion or the creation of mere belief or superstition, but an explanation, gained from analogy, of the phenomena which surround us and affect our senses. The dominants within the organisms are the immanent side, the cosmic reason the transcendental side of the same principle. Both are as little mystical concepts as is human reason; for all three are abstractions just as the concepts of energy, motion, force and matter. The assumption of a causal nexus between the cosmic reason and a plant is exactly as mystical or unmystical as the causal nexus between the intelligence of a technician and a gasmotor. However, there is a tremendous difference between engines and organisms, the production or creation of a living, reproducing cell requires a much greater consumption of intelligence than the manufacture of even the most complicated engine. For the greater the number of components in the physiological action, the larger the number of self regulators cooperating in the organism, the more marvellous must be the intelligence which created this organism and started its harmonious activity. Therefore, cosmic reason is at least as far above human reason as the inheritable organization of an animal is above an engine. According to this theory cosmic reason uses in its work only those natural forces which prevail in the inorganic world, viz., pure energies. In this respect cosmic reason is again very much like the engine building human reason. The useful organs of the plants and animals are *immediately* produced through the blind action of energies, and only mediately through the dominants which are the tools of cosmic reason. The manifestation of this reason is embodied in the organisms and is continuous, but only by constantly absorbing more energy without which every living being ceases to exist, just as the working of the engine would stop when the fuel is withdrawn. But the dominants, present in the cell as the product of cosmic reason, are not consumed as long as the life of the cell lasts, just as the human intelligence embodied in a watch is not consumed until the wheels are worn out and the watch stops. Both immanent intelligences are for

this reason not subject to the law of the conservation of energy. The same is true for the transcendental cosmic reason. It is not bound to space and time and needs not be fed by energy. Its essence remains for us an insoluble problem, because we can only know it by its effects and not by its tangible appearance. Of course the latter may be said of the human intelligence, but in this case we know at least its apparatus the brain with its appendages, the nerves and muscles.

There is much in this reasoning which seems very plausible even from the standpoint of pure science, although we learn nothing of the origin of this intelligence. But it suggests the solution of the riddles of the universe which the theory of accidental variation not only leaves unsolved but even further obscures. According to this hypothesis we may, therefore, distinguish three kinds of intelligence, viz., animal intelligence, as seen in the cunning of the dog, human and cosmic intelligence. None of them is visible or concrete but the first two have at least a concrete embodiment in the brain.

Bergson's mysterious power differs widely from this cosmic intelligence. It is somewhat akin to the logos of Greek philosophy and Christian theology, if these two can be at all named together. It is not one with inert matter nor does it develop parallel with matter, for it is not bound up with space and time. It has not of quantitative but purely of qualitative value. Its manifestations are not like those of a wound up automaton as is the case with mechanical phenomena and therefore not subject to rigid laws, but it is absolutely free and controlled only by choice. It is the *élan de la vie*, a supra-consciousness that is at the origin of life, the name for the rocket whose extinguished fragments fall back as matter, but also the name for that which subsists of the rocket itself, passing through the fragments and lighting them up into organisms. But this consciousness which is a *need of creation*, is made manifest to itself only where creation is possible. It lies dormant when life is condemned to automatism, it awakens as the possibility of a choice is restored. That is only in organisms unprovided with a

nervous system, it varies according to the power of locomotion and deformation of which the organism disposes. And in animals with a nervous system, it is proportional to the complexity of the switchboard on which the paths called sensory and the paths called motor intersect—that is of the brain. But this supra-consciousness does not spring from the brain it merely corresponds with the brain because equally they measure, the one by the complexity of its structure and the other by the intensity of its awareness, the quantity of choice that the living being has at its disposal. “The consciousness of a living being is inseparable from its brain in the sense in which a sharp knife is inseparable from the edge: the brain is the sharp edge by which consciousness cuts into the compact tissues of events, but the brain is no more coextensive with consciousness than the edge is with the knife.”

Life, therefore, is not a thing or substance but motion, it is identical with consciousness and freedom. It expresses itself in two directions, as tension and extension. The former is the free creative activity, the latter is relaxation, a sort of suppression produced by the detention of the will, suggesting the idea of a thing unmaking itself. It is in the latter direction that we find the characters of materiality. It is through matter that this supra-consciousness is individualized and unfolded in the individual organisms. The development of these organisms can therefore not be explained mechanically nor theologically after the manner of a ready made plan that is to be realized. Applied to the comparison between the eye of the Pecten and that of man we understand why Bergson rejects the mechanistic explanation of slow variation, aided by the laws of correlation and of optics, and insists that the function, which is consciousness, as tension or “the mysterious power” controls the ultimate structure, producing in widely different phyla the same high order of organs. Evolution, therefore, does not run in a straight line towards one goal such as human intelligence, but travels in different directions, ending sometimes in blind alleys. Rather evolution depends on the origi-

nal "élan de la vie," the life impulse, which out of its fullness and without a preconceived plan sends creative becoming ever onward. Evolution on the earth, therefore, proceeds in several distinct directions, distinct not only in degree but in kind, in the direction of torpor, characteristic of plants, the direction of instinct culminating in the hymenopteran insects and the direction of intelligence fully developed in man. In other words it is not matter which evolves by accidental variation, either slow or sudden, and in one straight line from the simple and homogeneous to the complex and heterogeneous but it is life as motion in three distinctive forms. This is after all the chief new thought which the French savant has given us and in which his theory of knowledge and his theory of life differ so fundamentally and so widely from modern biological thinking of the so-called mechanistic school.

However, we can hardly compare Bergson, the metaphysician, with the pure scientific thinkers, and yet he invites comparison because he attempts to unify the theory of knowledge and the theory of life, to unite the method of the metaphysician with that of the strictly empirical scientist. Kant never claimed pure scientific values for his speculative postulates. Bergson maintains that pure science can only be apprehended by the intellect, but the intellect deals only with ideas of space, its function is geometric thinking which cannot comprehend the inner essence of reality, neither in nature nor in the human heart, consequently metaphysics is impossible within the sphere of pure reason. The intellect only furnishes symbols for our practical conduct. It enables men to rule over nature by means of concrete tools. The "homo sapiens" is "homo faber." But the evolution of life has also developed a non-reflecting power, which apprehends *immediately* the elements necessary for the continuance of the individual and the species. This power is the instinct most fully developed in the Hymenoptera. In man this instinct lags far behind reason in matters of practical conduct. But it has by no means completely disappeared, on the contrary creative life has given it

a much more perfect form. The intellect is only the clear nucleus of consciousness. This is surrounded by the somewhat nebulous fringe of *immediate discernment*, which Bergson calls *intuition*. It is in the sphere of intuition that the spirit comprehends reality not merely relatively but absolutely, not symbolically but directly. Through this intuition the spirit comprehends also itself in its original character, which is not intellectual knowledge according to natural law, but creative will, choice and freedom. Intuition is therefore the source of metaphysics. For metaphysics is the science which needs no symbols, it is for practical purposes perhaps of no value whatever, but it leads to the true knowledge both of matter and of life.

This position is perhaps not entirely new in as much as it reminds us of the post-Kantian idealistic philosophy, especially of Schelling, it also recalls Descartes' attempts to construct a new intellectual metaphysics after the manner of geometry as over against Pascal's philosophy of experience.

We cannot quarrel with Bergson's theory of intuition, for it is not proved, but merely a matter of choice. Bergson claims to possess this intuition—as Schelling did before him, but he only attained to it after the most painful efforts, the spirit as it were twisting itself around itself. He seems to be convinced that knowledge by intuition is as sure as knowledge gained through the intellect, that would mean that knowledge in his philosophy is neither a mystic vision nor a simple postulate of practical reason but it is the very object of knowledge of a different human faculty, a somewhat mysterious spiritual power different from reason.

But the very weapons which Bergson uses against the mechanistic theory of life can be used against his own arguments. He would like to confine logic and concept to the sphere of mathematics and the natural sciences. But how can he convince us in any other way of the truth of his own claims than by the use of logic and concepts, for books are written and arguments carried on solely to convince people, otherwise the

writing of philosophical works is love's labor lost. The chief defect of the French philosopher's argumentation lies in the silent assumption that truth and reality are the same thing. As we are constituted we only obtain a knowledge of concrete realities by acknowledging the rationality of the reality. Just as any natural phenomenon must find its way to our senses in order to be felt or perceived at all, so also must the metaphysical knowledge of any real truth find its way somehow or other to our intelligence, *i. e.*, our human reason as it is at present constituted. Otherwise philosophizing would be utterly impossible, we could only surmise or hope or believe, which is pure mysticism. But Bergson does not count himself a mystic, otherwise he would be unassailable, for mysticism is a matter of subjective feeling which is difficult to controvert.

Herman Schön, the eminent German philosopher, says, that the author of *Creative Evolution* does not seem to know that pure intuitions without concepts are blind. He does not admit that the absolutely incomprehensible cannot be presented as given (*donné*), as real (*réel*), as determined (*déterminé*); for such attributes are already in themselves logical determinations. Therefore the speculation of the French thinker lacks the proper knowledge of its own limitation. It has no sufficient support in concepts and in logic. It lacks a systematic scientific foundation. It separates concept and reality to such a degree that one is at a loss how to combine them again, and yet after the separation has taken place, reality and truth are still looked upon as a unit whole. "Thereby," Schön says, "Bergson destroys the foundation of every scientific knowledge of every metaphysical system."

How then can we understand Bergson's position? Some say he is not a philosopher but a poet. Many of the passages of his book have the poetical note and charm, and there are times when the writer seems to restrain himself from adopting the express form of poetry. Moreover his total conception of life, the life impulse in its relation to nature, has a certain romantic, poetic value. His hope is that the *élan vitale*, which has been active in the universe from the beginning, will also

in the future act and create for the benefit of the whole, producing also in man ever new and unexpected forces and faculties, till it has gained the victory. And what is the victory? The triumph of freedom and choice won even in the dominion of the inert and predetermined, the rise of a new sense in man which would know things that to-day are still looked upon as supersensuous, because it surpasses our present sense-power. A time when intuition may grasp what is at present hidden to us, a time when this "aspiration vers le vrai," this "présentiment de la vérité," this "contemplation intuitive," of which he sometimes speaks, will see their object clearer and more distinct than it is possible to-day. There is really something inspiring in the idea. Perhaps then the method of intuition will seem more scientific than it is the case to-day. From a strictly poetical standpoint it is a legitimate view of nature.

But Bergson's views on the *élan vitale* and the creative evolution are from our present philosophical and scientific point of view very imperfect. They have not come nearer the solution of the riddle of the universe than Kant's *Critique*, which at least has exactly determined the limits of the realm of pure reason, while the intuitive philosophy leads only into illusive fields of romantic poetry.

It is after all only an assertion when our author speaks of the two kinds of living manifestations, the higher and the lower, which appear in the universe as the principles of the general and the individual, for he does not tell us clearly how these two principles are related to each other, nor how by mutual interaction they can produce the existing world, nor does he explain how or why the mighty stream of life has, in its impetuous rush, divided in two chief branches and directions, that of instinct and that of intelligence. We do not learn, how the instinct was almost lost in man, appearing only from time to time as an indefinite impulse, nor how intuition could, through consciousness, become the illumination of this almost lost instinct. Calling instinct an aesthetic faculty which enables man to enter his innermost being and finding

there his true personality, and declaring that this very faculty alone will reveal the significance of creative evolution sounds like the symbolic poetry of a revised romanticism, but not like scientific pronouncements. He is arguing in a circle when he calls intuition the ultimately only safe principle of our knowledge, because it forms the only reality immediately accessible to us, and then adds that the proof of this reality as the only true reality is intuition.

The mystic can only worship but never explain the mystery of the universe. If he seeks to know it he can only do so by a subjective and arbitrary "ipse dixit" because as a mystic he eschews reason. We cannot do violence to our human nature, either we must think with our intelligence and reason or not think at all and merely feel with our feeling. The laws of logic require the former, if we deny their validity we cannot think at all.

Nevertheless Bergson's philosophy is of tremendous significance in the present conflict of ideas. It points the way out of the chilly fog of a bald materialism and out of the lowlands of metaphysical positivism towards the heights of a more ideal view of life. By assigning the imperative of practical reason its proper place he aligns himself with Kant and the most eminent thinkers of his school.

The popularity of his philosophy is undoubtedly due to his sincere effort to combine modern progressive thinking with traditional views. He desires to give the exact sciences and their methods their place of honor, which belongs to them in a modern system, but at the same time wants to retain what is so dear to all representatives of idealism, the entities of freedom, spontaneity, responsibility and immortality. His philosophy therefore remains a splendid combination of scientific discussions and of mysticism, of positive facts and of gnostic thoughts, of lucid observations and unfulfilled hopes. But one thing must not be forgotten: whoever wants to retain his theistic idea of God may learn much from Bergson, but he can never be a Bergsonian.

IV.

THE MESSAGE OF THE BIBLE AS MATERIAL FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF THE JAPANESE.

JESSE F. STEINER.

Some years ago I made a short evangelistic trip to one of the inland towns of northern Japan where had been gathered together a small band of Christians. When I reached my hotel, the pastor informed me that arrangements had been made for a large public meeting in the theater that night at which I was to be the chief drawing card. My heart fell at this news, for I knew that my written sermons were not adapted to non-Christians and I was not yet fluent enough in the use of the language to speak extemporaneously. But all my efforts to get excused were in vain. The placards advertising the meeting were already posted in various parts of the town, and while I was not to be the only speaker, yet it was necessary for me to take my part since most of the people would come out of curiosity to hear the foreigner. I never enjoyed a meeting less. A more cold, drafty, uncomfortable place than the stage of a Japanese theater is hard to imagine. Besides the assembled crowd was very noisy and some of the bolder ones frequently interrupted the speakers who preceded me and created much disturbance. It was with much trepidation that I began my address, for I felt that my plain statements of Christian truth would certainly give offense. But to my surprise I was given the most quiet and respectful attention. As far as I could tell, all were favorably impressed with my message, and I sat down feeling that I had succeeded where the Japanese had failed. My Japanese colleagues were too courteous to tell me the real reason why my sermon had aroused no opposition. It

was only much later, after I had had more experience in addressing Japanese audiences, that I discovered that their respectful silence must be largely explained by the fact that they did not understand much of what I was saying. While my foreign accent was doubtless partly to blame for this, yet the chief reason was because the unfamiliar ideas of my sermon were expressed without any attempt being made to relate them to their own experience.

This incident in the life of a new missionary will serve in a measure to illustrate the problem that faces those who try to bring their religion to a foreign people. While mankind may be incurably religious, yet religions have varied so widely in their development that the most familiar ideas of one religion may be almost meaningless to the devotees of another. It sometimes happens that what one religion emphasizes as most sacred and full of uplifting meaning becomes ridiculous and impossible when interpreted in the religious conceptions of another people. The problem of giving our religious ideas to a foreign people is, then, far deeper than might at first appear. It involves an adaptation of our message to their needs, a presentation of it in terms that they can understand, and this can be done only by building upon the concepts of their own religious life.

Now I would not wish to convey the impression that this is a new principle or that it is one with which many religious propagandists are unacquainted. On the contrary, hard experience has taught men the necessity of this way of approach and it is more or less consciously followed by successful missionaries all over the world. The life of a missionary among a foreign people tends inevitably to mold him to their pattern. The man who lives in sympathetic touch with another race for a quarter of a century loses in great measure his own feeling of racial differences and gets out of touch with the viewpoint of his own nation. In Japan such missionaries are usually designated by the terms "pro-Japanese" or "orientalized," terms which indicate that in many matters of Mission policy

they are in closer sympathy with the native church than with the members of their own Mission. It is hardly necessary to remark that these "orientalized" missionaries are the ones to whom the Japanese go for advice, and that it is through their influence that the new Gospel gets its widest hearing.

It is not then a new principle that we wish to present in this article. In pedagogy, it is a commonplace that no absolutely new truth can be imparted to another. Unless it finds somewhere in the recesses of memory a truth sufficiently similar to bid it welcome, it will make no impression and will soon be forgotten. If there were no foundations upon which to build, the teaching process would be impossible. We know further that the same truth spoken to different people will not be similarly apperceived. The determining factor is the previous content of their minds.

This holds equally true in the sphere of missionary work. Whether the missionary is conscious of it or not, the content of the minds of the natives determines how they understand his message. He may be endeavoring to give them a conception of the Fatherhood of God, but their narrow outlook on life may cause the resulting picture to be a tribal god with a family differing very little from themselves. Or his presentation of Jesus as one who had power to heal diseases and restore the blind may result in their apperception of Jesus in terms of their own medicine men who are skilled in occult power. These simple pedagogical facts when considered with reference to the lower races make the task of the Christian teacher seem extremely difficult. It is indeed the same problem that is faced when we attempt to give a little child our higher religious conceptions. In both cases a satisfactory result can be attained only through a long process of education in which the untutored mind becomes gradually able to grasp higher truths.

But when we approach an intelligent people like the Japanese the case is quite different. For more than a thousand years they have been under the influence of Buddhism and Confucianism, two of the great religions of the world. Philo-

sophical conceptions of God and theories of salvation have long been familiar problems for discussion. Their best leaders have by no means neglected to hold forth high ideals of duty and righteousness. They have given deep thought to the same problems of life which we face here in the West. We can find very few moral teachings of Christ which would not be heartily seconded by the loyal follower of Confucius. The difference has been largely a difference of emphasis and of viewpoint, made inevitable by the different social situation out of which these religions developed. These facts are very significant, however we may be disposed to interpret them, but their significance vastly increases if we are able to free ourselves from our religious prejudices and estimate them at their true value. Our attitude too often has been that the non-Christian religions represent the degenerating tendencies of mankind; that the Buddhists and Confucianists once had an opportunity to know God more fully but because of their stubbornness and sinfulness they turned religion into magic and dragged God down into the dust. However an unprejudiced estimate of these religions must regard them rather as outgrowths of man's longing for God and his efforts to understand the deeper things of life.

This involves then a recognition of the fact that God has been working in Japan long before the missionaries arrived there. Various factors may have entered in to dwarf the Japanese religious conceptions and to prevent them from functioning properly. In spite of the efforts of their great religious leaders, they have never developed a system of truth that could in any sense be called adequate to satisfy the needs of men. But they represent attainments in religious culture which we dare not ignore, and have conserved some truths upon which the whole world can unite.

If then there are real values in the Oriental religions, if the foundations of religious truth have already been laid in the Far East, we are surely justified in saying that Christ's words, "I came not to destroy but to fulfill," apply as well to the

Buddhists to-day as to the Jewish religion of old. Just what is involved in such a fulfillment may be in a measure foreseen by recalling how Judaism was replaced by Christianity. When Christ's Jewish followers caught his spirit, they manifested a new life which refused to be confined within the old rites and ceremonies. Those things which were felt to be inconsistent with the new faith were soon abandoned. But Christ's message was delivered to them in the familiar symbols of their old religious life and their apperception of his teaching was conditioned by the religious thought of their day. Something of this same process must be passed through, when the spirit of Christ begins to dominate the thought-life of the Far East. The superstitions, philosophical fantasies, and crude beliefs which have caused the West to look upon these eastern religions as utterly hopeless and incapable of exerting any good, will fall away of themselves when exposed to the searching light of better truths. There is no need then to spend our time in combatting their intellectual errors or in showing the folly of their superstitions. The right method is rather to search out their better religious ideas which are the foundations upon which we have to build. With these as points of contact, our way of approach is made more easy, because we are connecting the new truth with facts of their own experience.

Any adequate attempt to find all the points of contact best fitted for our use would involve a careful review of the whole field of Japanese religious thought. However, such a survey within the limits of this article being impossible, we will consider only a few of their most fundamental religious ideas which may serve to show the value of this method of approach in leading them to the more adequate message as contained in the Bible.

First let us look at their conception of salvation through faith in the savior Amida Buddha. The strenuous self-discipline and the retirement from the world which were characteristic of medieval Buddhism, did not appeal to many of the

Japanese who desired a more practical kind of religion. Consequently under the leadership of a religious genius of the eleventh century, the Pure Land school was formed which changed the old doctrine of salvation by works into salvation by faith in a loving savior. This new school taught that in the western Paradise there lived Amida Buddha, who, out of compassion for struggling mankind, was willing to offer his great store of accumulated merit to all who would call upon his name. All that was required of the suppliant for divine favor was faith in Amida's power and an acknowledgment of Amida's goodness expressed in this prayer, *Namu Amida Buttsu* (Hail Thou Blessed Buddha).

This revolutionary doctrine was not entirely a new discovery on the part of the Japanese, for they were able to find sanction for it in some of the ancient sutras, but nevertheless the development of this idea of salvation was Japan's greatest contribution to religious thought. It is true that when subjected to a close study from the Christian standpoint, this doctrine loses some of its significance. Amida is such a vague and mythical character that he can not be made very real even to the lower classes who are disposed to believe the various legends about him. Then their faith in Amida does not involve conformity to his character, but is a blind trust which need not affect the individual's moral standards to any great extent. It is simply a belief that in some mysterious way Amida will enable them to escape the law of transmigration, and at death enter at once into Paradise.

However in spite of its inadequacies, it resembles so closely the Protestant doctrine of salvation by faith, that scholars have tried hard to establish a historical connection between the two religions. Whether or not these ideas have come from a common historical source, they at least show that both the East and West have the same longings for divine help in their struggle for righteousness. What a plain avenue of approach, therefore, this affords us in our presentation of Christ as the Savior of the world. It makes it possible for us

to present Christ to them in such terms that they will be able to see that his message instead of being a contradiction of all that is most sacred to them is really a more adequate fulfillment of their hopes. This will involve a more sympathetic attitude toward their religious attainments, for every step forward has brought them nearer the ideals of Christ and makes transition to his standards all the easier. By building upon the foundation they have already laid, their minds may be more disposed to see the possibilities of a higher faith as exemplified in the life and teachings of Christ.

It is estimated that about half of the Buddhists in Japan belong to this Pure Land school. The other half, divided up among various sects, holds in general to the more orthodox Buddhist doctrine of salvation by works. They believe that the goal can be attained only by severe self-discipline, by working out their own salvation at the cost of almost untold effort. The path to Buddhist enlightenment leads through many austerities and self-denials, and in fact requires so much time that no one can hope to make much progress unless he retires from the world. It is indeed a discouraging doctrine and there is no wonder that in Japan a Protestant Buddhism arose which claimed to make easier the road leading to Buddhahood.

With this type of Buddhism the point of contact for the Christian teacher does not seem so clear. Their world-view is so different from ours that the transition to Christianity requires a radical reconstruction of their thinking. Yet Christ and Buddha were working largely over the same problem. Buddha was oppressed with the suffering of the world, and the only way of escape he could find was self-extinction. Christ also felt deeply the suffering of the world, and his way of escape was to relieve men's sufferings. Both attained their goal, the one by conquering all his desires, the other by forgetting himself in loving ministry of others. Do we not have here a way of approach that ought to appeal to the Buddhist mind? The goal which during all the past centuries they have sought at the cost of untold pain and wearisome effort is found

near at hand ready to be grasped by those who share in Christ's ministry of service. The whole history of Buddhism shows how the human mind has rebelled against the thought of Nirvana as extinction. In their efforts to avoid this unattractive goal, various explanations of Nirvana have been advanced, the most extreme making it a mere sensual Paradise. In the midst of all this confusion about the goal of life, comes Christ's message that salvation is not merely some far off event but is a present reality to add joy to our life in this world. Instead of this being an evil world from which we must put forth our utmost efforts in order to escape, it is a world which we are to make better. With their emphasis on self-mastery and self-discipline Christ would have the greatest sympathy, for it has an important place in the building of character. Lest however it become too self-centered and thus defeat its own purpose, he would make its ruling principle self-sacrifice for the sake of others. By forgetting self in loving ministry of others, the peace of mind and happiness can be secured which they have always associated with the idea of Buddhahood.

One of the most important virtues in the eyes of the Japanese is that of loyalty. Loyalty might indeed be called the keynote of the Japanese nation. The geographical isolation, the comparative smallness of their territory, the necessity of presenting a united front to external foes, produced a social situation where loyalty to the ruling power became the chief virtue. In China the family had been supreme, but when Confucianism came to Japan, filial piety had to be subordinated to the interests of the state. During the days of feudalism this spirit manifested itself in fidelity to the feudal lord; in modern times all this passionate devotion has been transferred to their Emperor who personifies the best interests of their national life. The ideal which is ever held up before the Japanese youth is that of a loyalty which will endure the severest test. Probably their most popular story is that of the 47 Ronin, who in order to avenge the death of their prince, deserted their own families, forsook everything in life that was worth having, and

then when their purpose was accomplished, committed suicide with no outward sign of regret. A Japanese school reader tells the story of a young Japanese soldier in the Russo-Japanese war who was caught weeping over a letter written by a feminine hand. Upon being reproached for his weakness, he handed the letter to his lieutenant who found that it was a farewell message from the boy's widowed mother. It stated in simple words that since she feared that thought of her dependent position would weaken his courage, she had decided to commit suicide and thus leave him free to lay down his life for his Emperor.

A Japanese has no difficulty in understanding the spirit of these words of Paul: "For none of us liveth to himself and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." Or these words of Christ: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me." They well understand that in times of great crises when fundamental principles are at stake, even the most sacred relations of life must be subordinated to higher calls of duty. All this lies so near to the Christian idea of loyalty which counts all things as loss for Christ's sake, that we can see how well prepared they are to enter appreciatively into an understanding of the life of Christ. The story of the cross arouses their admiration for Jesus and disposes them to listen to his principles of life. Some find a stumbling block in their fear that allegiance to Christ will weaken their loyalty to their Emperor. Ultra-nationalists believe that it is disloyal to place even God above their Emperor. However when they become able to realize the spiritual nature of his kingdom, this objection will lose its significance for them.

Missionaries have too often had a tendency to decry this so-called Emperor-worship, feeling that where it existed, allegiance to God was impossible. But it should rather be used as a stepping stone to loyalty to the King of Kings. We should

give due recognition to the fact that all their past traditions have been preparing them to understand the heart of Christ. A great point of contact for us is found in that aspect of the Christian message which lays emphasis on loyalty, self-sacrifice, and devotion to superiors. Almost all will respond to these concepts, for whether a Japanese is a Buddhist, Confucianist, or Shintoist, he is first of all a loyalist who is ready to die for the cause he loves.

Another important religious concept of the Japanese is that of ancestor worship. Almost 1,500 years ago this custom was imported from China and since then has entrenched itself so strongly among the Japanese that it colors all their thinking and has woven itself into the very fiber of their nation. For the common people this custom has often degenerated into mere superstition and idolatry. On the anniversary of the dead food is placed before the ancestral tablets, and the more simple minded believe that the dead return to partake of this offering and that if this worship is neglected dire calamity will visit their house. Because of the superstitions connected with it, missionaries in general have felt that it is incompatible with Christianity. However, except for its superstitious aspect, it possesses a value that cannot be denied. The living feel the inspiration of the presence of those who have gone before, and thus are stimulated to do their part in adding honor to the family name. Their attitude is well expressed in these words from the letter to the Hebrews: "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." Looked at in this higher form it is far from objectionable and can easily be made an ally to help us in leading the Japanese to a worship of the Father-God.

President Harada of the Doshisha, a well-known scholar and Christian leader, holds this view as can be seen from the following quotation from his recent book, *The Faith of Japan*:

"It seems to me that the veneration of the Japanese for the

ancestors of the Imperial House and for their own ancestors is not a custom to be strongly condemned. How can we expect a man who feels no gratitude toward his own ancestors to have a true appreciation of the great mercy and goodness of God? Is it not for us to cultivate and guide this sentiment so that it shall be raised from mere reverence for human ancestors to worship of the great Father of all fathers? The man who thinks little of his ancestors will end by thinking little of God himself. Consequently, it seems to me that instead of attacking the so-called worship of ancestors, the better way is to emphasize its resemblance to the true worship of the Father of Lights, leading men on until they are willing to have the lower custom swallowed up in the higher, even as the light of the stars is swallowed up in the greater glory of the sun."

We will consider only one more of their religious ideas, namely, "Michi," the way of humanity. This Michi of the Japanese in its original content in primitive Japan meant merely to act in accord with nature. Later contact with Confucianism and Buddhism has filled in its ethical content until it has come to stand for much that is high and noble and of real value. The late Emperor of Japan in his Imperial Rescript on Education issued in 1890 has given the best expression of the meaning of this Way as applied to the practical duties of life. It says in part:

"Ye our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends, true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore, advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the state; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers. The Way here set

forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors to be observed alike by their descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, our subjects, that we may all attain to the same virtue."

This Imperial Rescript, during the past twenty-four years, has been read before all the schools in connection with the celebration of national holidays. It is read with as much formal ceremony as is usually observed in our churches and is listened to with greater reverence than we manifest when the Scriptures are publicly read. Therefore the influence of this ideal Way of Life cannot be lightly estimated. The best men of Japan have in their times of discouragement and difficulty received inspiration from it. Yoshida Shoin, a political leader of Restoration times, imprisoned because of his advanced views, uttered these words from the gloom of his cell:

"In the dark and dreary prison,
Where no step of love is heard,
Comfort brings the Way that
Ever was and is the living word."

It is easy to see the connection between the Way of the Japanese and the Way of Christ. Christ spoke of himself as the way, the truth, and the life. His disciples designated their faith in him as "the Way." Twenty centuries of Christian experience have demonstrated that this "Way" leads to nobility of character and uplift of soul. The Japanese well know the ideal values contained in the expression "the way of life." Their hearts respond to the Christian message when expressed in these terms and many have found it the pathway to the ideals of Christ.

The above have by no means exhausted the religious ideas of the Japanese but they are sufficient to indicate the kind of soil in which Christianity is to be planted. They enable us to see that the Japanese have been in a large measure prepared to understand the Christian message. There is indeed a good deal

of truth in the statement sometimes made that Buddhism and Confucianism were schoolmasters to lead the Orient to Christ.

Thus far in this discussion we have been considering how their religious ideas have prepared them for an understanding of the essential Christian message. There yet remains for us the even more difficult problem of how to present the Bible to them in an acceptable manner. Since the Bible is our chief written source of Christian truth, missionaries naturally lay stress on the study of the Bible as the best means of understanding the fundamental principles of Christianity. Through the efforts of the different Bible Societies the Bible is given as wide distribution as possible. Wherever a group of persons can be interested in the new religion, a Bible class is formed to study some portion of the Scriptures. We can easily see how important it is that there be wise guidance in their first contact with the Bible. So much depends on the selection of suitable passages and on the giving of intelligible explanations, for the Bible is not a mere compendium of Christian truth and is not adapted for indiscriminate reading.

Our problem is made all the more difficult by the fact that the Japanese do not possess our reverence for sacred books. The immense mass of Buddhist sutras are seldom looked at except by the priests. Very few of these sutras have been translated into Japanese. Hidden beneath this covering of a foreign language they lie neglected and almost forgotten. In one of the large temples in Tokyo is a revolving bookcase containing the 6,671 volumes that make up the Buddhist canon. On this bookcase is an inscription stating that he who turns it thrice around gains as much merit as if he had read through each separate volume. With such an idea of their sacred books we cannot expect them to approach our Bible in any great spirit of reverence. If it is to mean anything to them it must be because of the significance of the message which it contains.

Our problem then is how to present the Bible to them so that they may get from it the message it is intended to bring. A few missionaries in their zeal for completeness and chronological

order have begun with the book of Genesis and have endeavored to present the Old Testament in such a way that it might lay a good foundation for the understanding of the New Testament. Only patient and zealous inquirers however would submit to such a laborious undertaking, the value of which they were not in a position to see. It is generally recognized that the best way is to plunge at once into the study of the Gospels which contain the heart of the Christian message. The question then that faces us is which Gospel will make the best appeal to the Japanese mind.

The Gospel that is used most frequently by missionaries is Mark. The reason for this is because of its simplicity and its omission of some miracles and difficult passages which are found in the other Gospels. On the other hand it has been found that the Gospel of John is especially popular among the Buddhists. Recently some Buddhist priests of the progressive Shin sect ordered a large number of copies of John's Gospel for the use of their acolytes. Mature Japanese often select this Gospel for their study, and this preference is general enough to increase greatly its sales. The agent of the American Bible Society in Japan says that of all the Scripture portions issued, the Gospels of Mark and John are far in the lead in actual numbers circulated.

The Japanese interest in the Gospel of John can be easily understood when we recall the emphasis on meditation, contemplation, and mysticism in Buddhism, and see how closely related they are to John's interpretation of the Christian life. The western mind is practical while the Oriental is more mystical and seems to have a faculty for entering appreciatively into the experiences of those who lay stress upon communion and fellowship with God. In my opinion this fact has been too little recognized in our dealing with the Japanese. Buddhism has existed so long in Japan and has had such wide influence that it practically colors the thinking of the majority of the Japanese. Even those who profess to be agnostics or atheists have been brought up in Buddhist homes or at least

in Buddhist environment and can not help but be more or less sympathetic with the type of mind and temperament which long centuries of Buddhism have inculcated. That quality in John's Gospel which makes us feel that it is too difficult for a beginner may be the very thing which will attract the Japanese and help them to have a greater admiration for Christ.

As far as individual books of the Bible are concerned, the Gospels are usually the only ones used in presenting Christianity to non-believers. It is difficult to find any other books which taken as they stand would be of interest to those who know little about the Christian religion. Probably the nearest approach to this is the book of Proverbs which is much admired by the Confucianists because of its epigrammatic style resembling so closely the old Chinese classics.

The Bible then as a whole cannot be said to be attractive to the Japanese. Very few of its books are suitable for the use of inquirers. Even the Gospels as they stand are confusing because of their differences and they contain passages that are hard to understand. The only solution of the problem therefore would seem to lie in the working out of an abridged Bible consisting of the parts most likely to appeal to the Japanese mind. This would involve in the first place the reconstruction of the life of Christ in a connected manner, embracing the essential features of the four Gospels. Such a gospel might omit the genealogies, the first chapter of Luke containing the account of the annunciation, some of the more difficult parables and miracles, and passages which on account of their local color need considerable explanation. In the choice of material the governing principle should be to select that which would fit in best with Japanese life and experience. No attempt would be made to have it include all that is of value in the Gospels, for its purpose would be merely to serve as an introductory book for the use of non-Christians. The Gospel of John might be made the basis around which could be gathered the incidents and teachings that are expressed more clearly in the Synoptic Gospels. At any rate the Johannine interpretation of Christ should predominate.

The remainder of the New Testament cannot be said to make any strong appeal to the mass of the Japanese. This is undoubtedly because much that would be of interest to them is hidden away in the midst of material outside their range of interests. The striking life of Paul, the way he became the friend instead of the enemy of Christ, his experiences on his missionary journeys, as well as many of his addresses and portions of his epistles, if brought together by a combination and abridgment of the Acts and the Epistles, ought to prove to be an attractive volume for the Japanese inquirers. As it is now, their picture of Christianity is generally taken entirely from the Gospels. It seems to me that the New Testament picture of the struggles of the early Christians is striking enough to win the interest of the Japanese and contains so much analogous to the present social and religious unrest in their country that it ought to command their thoughtful attention.

The Old Testament is practically a closed book even to the Japanese Christians. The New Testament or the New Testament and the Psalms is the Christian's handbook. This is not strange when we stop to consider the kind of material that makes up a large part of the Old Testament. Besides, the historical sense of the Japanese is not very keenly developed and they do not feel the need of understanding the historical preparation for the work of Christ. The historicity of Jesus is not a matter of great moment with them. It is his character, his spiritual reality which arouses their admiration and induces their loyalty. Still, as they make progress, the background of the Old Testament is a great help in understanding the symbols and allusions of the Gospels. Therefore, if an abridgment of the different parts of the Old Testament could be made by selecting the passages of greatest interest, the religious experience of the Japanese might be enriched by the spiritual values contained in this old Hebrew literature. The Pentateuch and the historical books might be presented acceptably in a book similar to the "Heroes of Israel" in the Constructive Bible series. Hero-worship is characteristic of the Japanese.

The patriarchal life and ideals are familiar to them. The story of the escape from Egypt, the wandering life in the wilderness, the conquest of Palestine, and the formation of the kingdom will appeal to the Japanese whose real heroes are military men and who take great delight in deeds of valor. I see no reason why such a volume should not attain great popularity and contribute a great deal to the religious education of the Japanese.

In the same manner there might be prepared a volume of the poetry of the Old Testament which should contain the best of the Psalms and Proverbs. Such a selection, omitting not only the imprecatory Psalms but also the more obscure ones which are not well fitted for the expression of spiritual aspirations, ought to do much to make the Old Testament more significant in the eyes of the Japanese.

As for the prophetic material, it is doubtful whether any putting together of the more significant passages would mean much even for the Christian Japanese unless accompanied by adequate explanations. But if the historical situation is reconstructed for them so that they can see the prophets as zealous patriots pleading for justice and righteousness in order that their nation might not perish, the message of the prophets ought to gain a wide hearing. The Japanese, like the old Hebrews, are above all else intensely patriotic. To their dismay within the last year they have learned to know how deepseated are some of the forces of corruption that are undermining the stability of their government. In this time of need they have raised up their prophets, men of high ideals, who are boldly denouncing this wickedness in high places in their efforts to save their nation. What an inspiration the Hebrew prophets might bring the Japanese people in this time of national crisis, if their message were put in a form that all could understand.

It ought to be mentioned here that in all our efforts to give the Japanese our Bible we must not overlook the drawback of an inadequate translation. One element in our Bible which makes it so attractive to us is the excellent literary style of our

English version. For generations men have looked up to it as a model of classic English prose. Unfortunately, the existing Japanese translation lacks this literary quality. Compared with their old classics it must take a secondary place as far as style is concerned. At present a revision committee is working on a new translation which it is hoped will give the Bible the prestige of literary excellence. Until a translation is produced which will be recognized by their scholars as worthy of a place among their classics, the Bible will continue to be looked upon as a foreign book, of interest only to those curious to know about Christianity.

In conclusion, we wish to offer some suggestions about the preparation of a graded course of Sunday-school lessons intended especially for the Japanese. At present the Japanese churches use the International Lessons, a course of study that is not well adapted even to the needs of the children of a Christian nation. The reasons that have led to its adoption are easy to see. It makes available to the Japanese Sunday-school teachers the vast body of material issued in America and England in explanation of the lessons. Then further it is inspiring to be a part of a world wide movement and to feel that Christians everywhere are at the same time united in study of a common passage of Scripture.

It takes but very little thought to see the incongruity of their use of the International System which was never designed for schools in non-Christian lands. For a whole quarter its lessons may be found in the prophetic books or in the Pauline epistles or other portions of the Bible not adapted to the use of the non-Christian Japanese. The isolated and disconnected passages also are subject to serious criticism, for although they may follow a general theme yet not sufficient Bible material is given to make a connected narrative. In practice, it usually results in the few verses of Scripture being used as a text on the basis of which the teacher gives some moral instruction. What is required in Japan is a course of study that would make central the needs of the Japanese rather than the religious material

itself. The question of fundamental importance is to find out what their personalities need for their highest development. The experience of the past fifty years of Christian work in Japan has proven that the Bible does contain a message which has power to transform their lives and give them a hope and faith they have never possessed before. We must not, however, make the mistake of assuming that our pathway to a better knowledge of this message is the best path for them to follow. Their religious traditions, national ideals, and social inheritance have given them a bias of mind, a mental attitude, which must be reckoned with.

It ought to require no further statement to make it clear that the Japanese Sunday-schools need a graded course of study specially prepared for their use. The central theme of the curriculum should be the life of Christ. For each grade a course in the life of Christ should be prepared which should present in a connected manner those incidents and teachings best suited to the children's needs. The monotony of this concentration on the life of Christ could be avoided by lessons from nature for the smaller children and by hero stories for the older children. Such stories might be taken from different portions of the Bible and from Christian history, and certainly ought to include some of the heroes of old Japan whose lives were spent in the uplift of their nation. For the advanced classes courses might be prepared in the life of Paul, messages of the prophets, comparative religions, moral problems of daily life, and great characters of history. An important thing in the construction of the curriculum is to realize that the Bible need not be the sole basis for religious instruction.

One of the points of greatest weakness in Japanese Sunday-schools is the poor provision made for boys and girls of high school age. In fact comparatively few children above 13 or 14 years of age are found in the Sunday-schools. It is sometimes claimed that this is because of the pressure of the family which always becomes more severe as the child approaches maturity. While this may have its influence, a more vital reason is prob-

ably that the children have arrived at the age of evaluation and drop out because they do not find anything in the Sunday-schools worth while. Special efforts ought to be made to retain their interest. Those who have become Christians ought to be enrolled in classes that would make a more advanced study of Christian principles. For the non-Christians, text-books should be prepared that would dignify their study of Christianity and make them feel that it was well worth their time.

To work out in greater detail a graded course of study is beyond the purpose of this article and must be reserved for some future time. Our desire has been merely to call attention to some of the principles involved and to suggest an outline that might be followed in working out a solution of the problem. The importance of the Sunday-school as a Christianizing agency in Japan is so great that it is hoped much study will be given to the problem of the construction of a suitable curriculum. Anyone who has seen the slow and painful process by which through regular evangelistic preaching converts are brought into the church, is tempted to believe that it is only by the religious education of the children that the Japanese nation can be made Christian. Fifty years ago when the present leaders of Japan were in the impressionable age of childhood, the Bible was a proscribed book. Notice boards were set up on every highway stating that anyone who possessed or even read this hated book should be liable to the most severe punishment. Can we wonder that these men to-day have a secret dislike of the Christian message, which they find it hard to overcome. But if we are wise and tactful in our presentation of the Bible to the children of the present day, this unreasoning prejudice will disappear and the way will be open for more effective progress.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
CHICAGO, ILL.

V.

THE CHURCH AND THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM.

A. E. DAHLMANN.

The "Immigration Problem" has aroused the anxiety, awakened the attention and interest, and stimulated to intense effort, liberal giving and sacrificing service the best manhood and womanhood of the American people and the Christian churches of our land. In proof of this seemingly sweeping assertion I refer you to the books written by such men as Rauschenbusch, Hall, Steiner, Shriver and others, dealing directly and indirectly with this subject; to the many articles referring to it in the best magazines of our time; to the many phases of settlement work, especially Christian settlement work in the larger and smaller cities; to the benefactions given and the lives devoted to social Christian service which deals to a great extent with the immigrant and his children in the first and second generation; and the widespread interest in this subject among the intelligent membership of the Christian churches in our country.

The problem which confronts the nation and the church may briefly be stated as follows: "What should and can be done to assimilate with and into our American Christian nationality the many foreign peoples who are swarming into our land at the average rate of 850,000 every year; to assimilate them in such a way that instead of proving a danger they become a forceful leaven in working out our destiny as a nation, instead of lowering *enhance* our national vitality, physically, intellectually and morally, instead of proving a hindrance become a *vital helpful force* in advancing the *kingdom* of God."

Immigration has grown to be a problem within the last ten years as never before. Not only that never before have so large

numbers come to our shores from foreign lands, but that never before has there been an influx of people so different from the average American in language, race and temperament, in political and religious viewpoint, in their manners and customs of living. Almost four-fifths of the immigration from Europe during the last five years came from southern and southeastern Europe, from the Slavic, modern Greek and Italian nationalities, whose political, intellectual and religious condition is unfortunately inferior to that of the peoples of northern and western Europe and the United States, and whose plane of living is below that of the American, so that they consider as luxuries what the latter regards as necessities of life. These people constitute a large part of the population of our cities east and west, and many of them having become naturalized citizens, they hold the balance of political power; and being easily induced to align themselves with the forces opposing moral reform, civic righteousness and good government, and to follow and support the corrupt politician, the office-seeker and demagogue, they are apt to become a dangerous *political* element of the community in which they live. By segregation and colonizing they form communities within communities, they populate the tenement and slum districts of our large cities; and the overcrowding and sweatshops, the filth and squalor, the immoralities and vices of these little Italys, little Polands, little Russias, little Hungarys and Palestines, in our large cities, very often make them breeding places and centers of contagious diseases physically and morally, spreading poisonous miasmas which endanger the whole population. Immigrants furnish the labor market with abundant supplies, lowering the rate of wages in many pursuits, crowding out American labor which cannot compete with them on account of the living wage which it requires. It is very natural that the unskilled American laborer should feel unfriendly toward his immigrant competitor and treat him with contempt because he will do the same work much more cheaply than he and crowd him out of a job. But this very fact has induced the native born, gifted with a good

share of common sense, on the one hand to fit himself and seek for a higher grade of labor, requiring finer brain if not greater brawn; on the other hand to affiliate with the foreigner, to teach him that he need not be satisfied with the crumbs and crusts, but that he has the same right to the whole loaf as his American brother; and to draw him into the labor union with its uniform wage, its professed equal opportunity and protection for all. And here the immigrant becomes another source of danger. He is often wanting in intelligence and self control. His prejudices warp his judgment. His passions are quickly inflamed and the harangue of the socialist agitator easily embroils him in mob violence, in wanton destruction of property and bloodshed, widening and deepening the gap between capital and labor, the classes and the masses. No class of our population is as responsive, none offers to the labor agitator, the demagogue and socialist so promising and fruitful a field to cultivate, as the mass of foreigners who have come and are coming to our land from eastern and southern Europe. The religion of most of these people in their homeland was nothing more than an observance of external rites and ceremonies and a subjection to the church and its hierarchy, which stifled the nobler aspirations of the human soul for truth, righteousness, purity and peace; for personal communion and fellowship with God. Some of them retain a very formal and loose connection with the church in this country; others, and probably the great majority, cut loose from the church which has proven to them more of a crushing taskmaster than a fostering mother, and severing all their religious moorings they drift into gross infidelity, into a life of abject service of the world, the flesh and the devil, a life without God and without hope in the world and a death which is the blackness of darkness of eternal despair.

Recalling the difficulties and dangers which are connected with these foreign peoples who come seeking new homes in our hospitable land, difficulties and dangers politically, socially, morally and religiously, to which I could only very briefly

refer, the *Immigration Problem*, the *problem* what *can* and *should* we do to avert the danger, to assimilate the immigrant to our national and Christian life and civilization, to help him to a higher plane of living and character, to help him find and make a *home* in *this* land of the free and home of the brave not only, but also in that land beautiful, of everlasting life? what *can* and *should* we do to transform these immigrant forces which may blot and mar and sap the life out of our free institutions, into forces which will add new strength, beauty and life to this great nation, great in its inception, wonderful in its development, great in its destiny? *THIS problem* looms up very large before us.

What has the *church* of the Lord Jesus Christ to do with the *solution* of this problem, is the question which more particularly demands our attention on this occasion. Isn't it the special province and mission of the *state* to safeguard our free institutions and our national prosperity, to wisely enact and execute laws which will protect our land from any dangers threatening us from immigration, promote the amalgamation of the different nationalities entering into and constituting the body politic into one compact, great and strong nationality, and secure the highest good of the greatest number, which will also be the highest good of the individual citizen? Have we not every reason to feel reassured and to compliment ourselves on account of the wise statesmanship, which seeks to guard the immigrants' door of entrance into our land in such a manner, as to exclude all physically and morally undesirable aliens; the statesmanship which provides sanitary regulations, controls the building of tenements and the housing in the overcrowded districts in our large cities, eliminates the evils of the sweat-shop system, child labor and the liquor traffic, prohibits gambling and the social evil, protects the national health by its pure food laws? Have we not every reason to rejoice in that statesmanship which regulates trusts and monopolies and prevents the exploitation of the natural resources of our country and the forces of labor, in the interest of the few to the detriment of

the many? the statesmanship which strives to establish and maintain a high standard of civic righteousness in politics and the business and manufacturing interests of the country? And whatever defects may be found in our *public school system* by critics wise and otherwise, is not this great national educational agency, steadily advancing in efficiency, a powerful factor for the assimilation of the foreign population especially the younger generation? Are we not as *Christian* citizens doing our duty and contributing all in our power toward the accomplishment of the desired end, by giving all these policies and measures our hearty sympathy and supporting them by voice and vote and our wholesouled cooperation? What lines of activity in *addition* to those just mentioned are open to the *church* for its share in the solution of this great immigration problem? Has it any obligation or mission in this direction? Is not its purpose and work the advancement of the kingdom of God, a work which enlists *all* its energies, *all its devotion* and *all the resources* divine and human at its disposal? Is not this immigration problem chiefly of a *secular* nature outside of the mission of the church, and should not the benevolent work required, such as is done in the settlement houses among the immigrant population, be left to individual philanthropy and the organized benevolent associations who have it in charge?

I claim that the church of the Lord Jesus Christ is the divinely appointed and most efficient agency for the betterment of human conditions, the righting of wrongs, the lifting of burdens from the minds, the hearts and the lives of men, for the *regeneration* of the *individual* and the *reformation* of *society*. Surely the purpose for which it exists is to make the kingdom of God a reality in the hearts and lives of individuals and in society at large. There is a great truth in the well-worn phrase, that Jesus Christ is the saviour of society as well as of the individual. The very *conception* of the kingdom of God embodies this truth. The kingdom of God is not wholly and entirely otherworldly. It is not confined to the heavenly Jerusalem and to the glory of the redeemed. The kingdom of

God, said our Lord, is within you. It is righteousness, joy and peace in the Holy Ghost. It is the dominion of God and His love in the hearts and lives of men, here and now. Jesus proclaimed the coming of this kingdom and its reality in His own person and offered its blessings to all who by repentance and faith would enter into vital fellowship with Him. And from that day to this wherever there is a man or woman, a youth or maiden, who have made Jesus King of their hearts, *there* is the kingdom of God. Each one of these is a nucleus of divine life and love, and is to become a bright and shining light, shining more and more until the perfect day. And just as certainly as the life of the tree bursts forth in leaf and bud and blossom and fruit, so surely will the life of God, the life of faith in the soul, burst forth in the fruitage of good works, works of love to God our Father in Christ, and to our fellow man, our brother. Every Christian is to be, and in the degree in which he is a Christian indeed, he is a *center of vital spiritual force*, affecting every one in some way who comes in contact with it. He is no more *self* centered but *Christ* centered, and therefore he is as little indifferent to anything that is human as his master was. The Christ spirit within him arouses his conscience to a fine sense of his responsibility for his brother man's temporal and spiritual weal and woe; kindles within his heart the burning zeal for loyal and loving service, be it ever so humble; directs him to understand and choose the most efficient service he can render. A live congregation is a *larger* center of spiritual life and power, in which the individual spiritual forces coalesce into an enlarged force of service and spiritual uplift for the community surrounding it. All the spiritual forces of the various congregations and churches are to converge and coalesce into the great universal church of Christ, of which each particular church, recognizing Jesus the eternal and only begotten son of God, incarnate, as Lord and King, is an integral part. This is to be a great spiritual power-house from which mighty life currents for the regeneration of the individual and society go out into the world in all directions. We all know that our Lord

compared the kingdom of God to leaven whose power permeates and changes the whole mass in which it is hid. So the mighty spiritual force proceeding out of the heart of God as revealed in Jesus Christ the crucified and risen redeemer, is to permeate and regenerate the *individual* heart and life, and *society* in all its forms, activities and agencies, until He whose right it is to rule is crowned Lord of all. This spiritual leavening and transformation of *society* is no less the mission of the church, than the salvation and regeneration of the individual, a mission to which she is called and for which she is equipped by her divine Lord. Will the church of today be true to her mission and live up to her privilege? Will the churches of our land, and the Reformed church as well as any of them, respond to the call of their Lord when presented to them in the immigration problem claiming their share for its solution?

The church must *recognize* and *meet* its obligation to the *state* in dealing with this problem. It should ever heed the admonition of its Lord: "give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's!" It enjoys its freedom, it has the right of way for all its activities, the guarantee of the security of all its possessions and institutions on account of the constant protection of the state. It is under obligation to render an important service to the state in return. It is to keep intact and strengthen the foundation on which the state is built, the pillars on which it rests. These are intelligence, morality and religion. Government of the people, for the people and by the people requires an *intelligent* people. *Righteousness* exalteth a nation, but sin is the destruction of any people. Fear and obedience to God and high regard and obedience to the laws of the land; loyalty to God and loyalty to one's native land; interest in the kingdom of God and interest in the well being and prosperity of the state, are necessarily connected as cause and effect. It is therefore a sacred obligation of the *church to the state* to advance intelligence, morality and religion among the foreigners immigrating to our land. A quiet but important work is done in this direction by the missions and mission-settlement-houses

with their educational, manual training and vocational classes, their Sunday-schools and religious services. No less important is the work of the churches in creating public opinion and sentiment against overcrowding in tenements, against the sweatshop and child labor, against gambling and low amusements, and for sanitation and cleanliness. A great part of this work is done under the auspices of the churches to-day; and what is done by private parties and extra-church-organizations, was originated and stimulated through influences going out from the churches.

But the church must also recognize and meet its obligation to the *immigrant* as a *brother man* for whom Christ died. The immigrant is not only an entire stranger but to the most of us he is anything but congenial. Whether he be Italian, Pole, Hungarian, Slav, or of whatever other nationality, when we come in contact with him on the trolley car or the railroad train, the ferry or the steamboat, we sit as far away from him as possible, scarcely give him the information sought, gasp for a breath of fresh air from the open window, and heave a sigh of relief when either he or we can part company. When he moves into the neighborhood where we live, we deplore its decline in respectability and its contamination by all sorts of contagions and look around for a better location for ourselves. If he happens to become our neighbor, we are not as generous in extending to him the common civilities of life as we would be, if he were only somebody else than a hunyack, a dago or a slav. If his daughter or sister is a servant in our home, we keep her in the kitchen, give our orders, pay her wages, but otherwise are entirely oblivious of her excepting as a well paid hired help for our convenience. We would scarcely think of such a thing as receiving and treating her as a member of our family. If we are teachers of the public schools, the immigrant's children are never our pets, it seems a *special* sin for us to be partial to them in our markings, and it is *they* who must bear the brunt of our ill humor. It is interesting enough for us to go through the little Italys, little Polands, little Rus-

sias in our large cities, to see the crowded tenements with their dirty windows and broken panes of glass, the doorsteps filled with untidy women engaged in gossip, the swarming children, the dirty streets and the filthy back yards. But if those of us who have the time and opportunity were asked to teach in the mission school, help in the settlement work among these foreigners, visit them in their homes and personally minister to their temporal and spiritual wants, would there be only very few of us who would consider such request as an affront, and entirely wanting in good taste and common sense? When we employ them in our mills and factories and mines, on our railroads and docks, we pay them the wage agreed upon and are well satisfied that it is lower than the wage-rate of our American brother, but we consider it as foolish and sentimental talk that we treat them not merely as hands but as brother men, and that we are under obligation to care for their temporal, moral and spiritual welfare.

It might be a blessing to many of us of the German Reformed Church, if we could have a very realistic vision of our forefathers 150–200 years ago as they immigrated to this country with “*Kind und Kegel*,” as we Germans say. They came into a land with language and customs very different from their own. They had many unpleasant experiences from the nativistic spirit of some of the descendants of the *earlier* immigrants into this land of the red man, of Puritan and Scotch-Irish stock. They entered the thickness and wilds of the forest to establish new homes, with a determination and bravery born of faith in God and loyalty to the truth in Christ as they saw it. It was a foregone conclusion that they would succeed, that they would bequeath to their descendants the rich legacy of lands and estates, of intelligence and Christian manhood, of achievement and influence, which we prize, and by which the German element has become a vital force, an important factor in our national life and development. The history of the loneliness and homesickness, the hardships, deprivations and suffering they passed through, the unfriendliness they experienced from

their white brothers has never been fully written and never will be. But from the data we have, we can construct a vivid picture of their experiences, which may not differ greatly from the facts. And if we do, we may be able to enter into the thoughts and feelings and experiences of the immigrant of to-day not only, but our *hearts* may grow warm with sympathy for him and a desire to help him, who, though he may not have the same natural endowments and opportunities as were granted to the immigrant of old of Puritan, Scotch-Irish, Huguenot and German stock, is our fellow man, our brother, bearing just as we the traces of the image of God within him, having an eternity in his spirit, identified with us in the words of the apostle: "There is no difference, they all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"; included in the "all" whom God desires to be saved and brought to a knowledge of the truth, the "every man," for whom Christ tasted death upon the cross; the world, which Christ so loved, etc.; to be counted among that innumerable host of those, who from all nations and tongues and languages have washed their robes in the blood of the lamb and are gathered into the eternal city of God.

As Christians we believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, no new truth at all as some would have us believe, but taught and believed by the church of all ages, perhaps *lived* in certain ages more consistently than to-day when it is professed so loudly. Not to *profess* this faith, not to *laud* it, not to *prize* it as a new thought of the new theology but TO LIVE IT, is the trumpet call which should resound through the church to-day and reecho in the heart of every church member. The immigrant, whether he be congenial to us or not, whether or not he is deprived of advantages which we have, whether or not there is a great difference between us and him in intelligence, culture and station in life, is *our brother*, and we are under solemn and sacred obligations to him of love, of sympathy, of service; obligations to help him toward the betterment of his temporal conditions, toward the attainment of moral character and Christian manhood; to help him toward

the participation and enjoyment of all the blessings and privileges which by the mercy of God are the birthright of every native born American citizen, and to citizenship in the eternal kingdom of God. "Owe no man anything but that ye love one another." The settlement of this account will not be completed in this world; it will be our glorious privilege in eternity.

At times the immigrant himself gives us a rather humiliating example of *living* the truth of the brotherhood of man. Permit me to refer to an instance of the kind which may not be new to you. On a rainy evening a Pole, returning from work, gave his seat in a crowded street car to a richly attired young lady who had just entered. She took the seat without acknowledging the favor. The Pole stood before her, holding himself at the strap in such a way that his hand was over her new and beautiful hat. He remained standing in that position though there was room for him to move forward. The young lady was indignant at his action, considering it an affront. She indicated her displeasure to the conductor who told the man to move on. As he moved on he said to the lady, pointing to the open ventilator above her, "the rain spoil your hat." Looking up she noticed the water coming down in a little stream above her. She noticed at the same time that the Pole's sleeve and coat were soaked with the rain. He had held his hand in such a way as to divert the water from her hat down his sleeve and arm. Shamefaced she thanked him politely for his kindness. Let us learn the lesson in living the truth of the brotherhood of man by *including* the immigrant, our brother, in our *life of service* in Christ's name and for his sake.

But the church also has an OBLIGATION to GOD with reference to the immigration problem. Unless it recognizes and meets this obligation, it will neither be loyal to its Lord nor faithful in the discharge of its trust. It is the mission of the Christian church to extend the kingdom of God and further the dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ in this world, by its preaching and teaching, its devotion and service. For this purpose she has been established on the day of Pentecost,

kept safely in all the storms which swept over her and amid all the assaults of her enemies, and enjoys the presence and power of the crucified, risen and glorified Christ working in and through her by His Holy Spirit, as much to-day as ever before. Her endowment with the presence and power of the living Christ, is a divine challenge and encouragement for her to fulfill her mission and to meet her obligation to her divine Lord. If the work of extending the kingdom lags, she grieves her Lord by her disloyalty, cuts off the rich supplies of grace He has in store for her and loses her vitality as the fields and meadows in the drought of summer. Her chief work to which all else is subordinate, is the salvation of sinners and the edification of believers. For her to substitute for this any other line of effort is disloyal and suicidal. Her history furnishes abundant proof that every time she has lost sight of this her great mission, the one paramount to all others, to bring men into the right personal relations to God by the preaching and teaching of the Gospel of the crucified, risen, glorified and ever present Redeemer, she has lost her grip on the people, her influence in society, and from being a spiritual dynamic, has changed into an organization for perpetuating a religion without vitality and power, in danger of becoming a mere relic of the past like some architectural monument of the middle ages. Such was the condition of the mediæval church, the church of the eighteenth century in Europe with its message of a formal orthodoxy without the living Christ; the church during the prevalence of deism and rationalism. And what mean all those deplorable facts to-day, of the loss of the church's grip on the minds, the hearts and consciences of the people in our land, of the falling off of church attendance throughout the whole country, the decline of faith in divine revelation and the widespread doubt even among professing Christians as to the essential truths of evangelical Christianity? Efforts to make the sermons interesting by illustration and anecdote, to draw the masses by fine music, advertisement of catchy subjects, discussion of political, civic, literary and scientific

topics, the introduction of the stereopticon, the providing of entertainment and amusement under religious auspices, have not improved the situation. What has brought it about? Has the message of the redeeming love and regenerating grace of God in Christ lost its meaning and power for our age? The preacher who brings this message to his people in a simple, practical and vital manner, does *not* preach to empty pews even in *this* age of Higher Criticism and the New Theology said to be adjusted to the literature, science and philosophy of the present day. But the *want* of such a message, or the *substitution* for it of another, even though it be the so-called social gospel, empties the churches and emasculates Christianity to-day as it has done in the past. May the church's conviction and consciousness of this its great and central mission ever be clear and strong! God forbid that it try to replace it by another, that it yield to the temptation to place what belongs in the center on the circumference! May every minister of our beloved Reformed Church follow the example of those faithful men, some of whom are well known throughout our land, whose preaching and service is first and last and always a witness to the crucified and risen Redeemer, without whom there is no salvation, and than whose name there is none other given among men whereby they can be saved, and whose churches whether they occupy a metropolitan pulpit or that of a country church, are always well filled.

On the other hand, however, we dare not overlook the fact, that in this great and central mission of the church is included that of social service. Jesus brought the kingdom of God into the world in His own person. He brought it into the hearts of men as a regenerating power. But He brought it also into the *homes* of the *people*, into their social and civic relations, as the *sunshine of heaven* scattering the clouds of misery and want, of sickness and sorrow; as a regenerating power in society which makes for righteousness in all the departments and activities of life in this world. And He means to continue this work by His followers through all ages.

It is *not* a mutilated but a *whole* Gospel which His disciples, and we among them, are to bring to the whole world. Love to God is to manifest itself in helpful saving love to our brother man, here and now. He who does not love his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God whom he seeth not. Devotion to Christ is to prove its sincerity by the loving service of our fellow man, even the least of whom He considers His brethren. And *that faith* will only count, *that life* will only be worth while before the great white throne of the judge of all, which has approved itself in the loving service of others. Whatsoever ye have done to one of the least of these my brethren, etc. The Christian's life is to be one of mutual burden-bearing, growing all the richer and happier by this work of love. We are to be coworkers with God in the advancement of His kingdom which is to bring healing to the *souls* and the *betterment* of *all* human conditions in *this* world. Perhaps the only avenue to reach many a soul is by giving him relief in the distress and misery or the crushing poverty under which he staggers to despair. And if we neglect this service, this burden-bearing, this relief, we stand convicted as insincere, unfaithful and disloyal to our Lord before the judgment of our own consciences, and much more so before the judgment of Him who searches the heart.

It is this our obligation to God for the advancement of His kingdom in this world, which must be recognized and met by the church in regard to the immigration problem. It is God Himself who challenges the church and every member of it, to consider the immigrant with the spirit of Christian sympathy and love; to extend to him the helping hand of the older and better situated brother; to help him rise to an intelligent American citizen, to all the privileges, rights and duties of American citizenship; above all to bring him the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ which is the power of God unto salvation, a salvation begun here and now and completed in glory. This Gospel must be given to him in his own language, the language which he understands, which is nearest and dearest to his heart, his mother tongue.

One word more in behalf of our German brothers and sisters. For many years they constituted the predominant element in the immigration to this country. Now they are a comparatively small percentage. They rank above the others in intelligence, frugality, industry and success. They have become a strong and vital factor in our American nationality. There are a number of states in the union whose nationality is predominantly German. The German churches such as ours are an important factor in American Christianity. Flourishing German congregations are found throughout our land from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the great lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. There is a large and promising mission field among them, especially in the Middle and Far West. There are opportunities and demands in large numbers for German and German-English missions. Who has a better right, who can do a better work, who has a greater duty in this direction than the Reformed and Lutheran Churches? These people are our brothers and sisters. They as no others form the constituency of the Reformed Church. They furnish the most promising mission fields. The growth and future of the Reformed Church is found among them. We Germans need men and means, enlargement and better support of our educational institutions to do this work. We are late in many places, but not too late. If the Reformed Church of the English and German Synods would unite in this work, what a glorious harvest could be reaped for the Master!

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

VI.

THE OLD AND NEW PROTESTANTISM.

PAUL B. RUPP.

Leo X. cynically dubbed the German Reformation "a squabble of monks." Martin Luther considered it the restoration of evangelical doctrine upon the basis of an infallible Bible. But the Reformation was, in fact, a climax of movements, social, economic, intellectual, religious, which helped to unloose, in part, the chains which had long bound the medieval man, and send him onward in his journey of life rejoicing in his newly-found freedom. For several generations the intellectuals of Europe had become increasingly discontented with the existing order of life. They were beginning to feel that traditional notions, customs, and institutions were no longer efficiently ministering to the expanding needs of the time. Great discoveries, like that of America, had given Europe her first world-wide vision; while great inventions, like the printing-press and compass, stirred her imagination with the thought of the limitless progress in store for her. The Humanists scathingly criticized existing conditions, especially the ecclesiastical system, and stimulated men to seek a better.

Europe was in the throes of chaotic ferment. Oriental diseases, originating in her close contact with the East, were carrying off her people by the tens of thousands. Famines had so frequently desolated her lands that the lower classes were living in the most abject poverty, able to eke out only the barest existence. Wars and rumors of wars kept the people in constant uproar. To the east the Turks were knocking for admittance upon the doors of Europe, approaching even to the gates of Vienna. Many believed that the end of the world was at hand, and, as an antidote for their fear,

reverted to a crude form of piety. Thus fasting, pilgrimages to sacred shrines, and an intensified form of monasticism became the especial marks of the immediate pre-Reformation days. While open skepticism best describes the mental attitude of the intellectuals, crass superstition characterized the common people. And by this reversion to an accentuated ecclesiasticism the church was granted a new lease of life.

Now the church had been the most influential factor in the medieval world, for she had always kept a tight rein upon her followers. She was therefore held largely responsible by the radicals of the time for most of the current ills. Thus far, however, most of the complaint of the Humanists, such as Erasmus in his *Praise of Folly*, and others, had been directed only against the ignorance, immorality and venality of the clergy. But the principles, upon which the ecclesiastical structure was built, were not called into question until the Reformation had been well launched upon its way. Criticism was concerned more with a matter of abuse than with the principle upon which the abuse was based. But men, fortunately, were beginning to do their own thinking. Some were already obsessed with the idea that there was something fundamentally wrong with their spiritual mother, and were ready to diagnose her case, even though the process involved a change in the status of the church herself.

The penitential system finally brought matters to a climax. The coffers of the church were becoming depleted. They must be refilled. But the normal revenues of the church were not sufficient for her normal but enormous expenses. The selling of indulgences offered the easiest solution of the problem. Then it was that Luther and Zwingli stood forth as the champions of a long-suffering people, and denounced both the system of penance and its abuse. Luther's *Ninety-five Theses*, nailed to the door of the Wittenberg Church, were the Magna Charta of the German people. These theses formed a happy medium of expression for the growing anger of the northern nations against their financial exploitation by the Italian

papacy. Luther's later manifesto, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* was rather a programme of social and ecclesiastical reform than an exposition of theological doctrine. His doctrinal reformation came later. Likewise, Zwingli in Switzerland was more concerned with the improper mode of remitting sins by the sale of indulgences than with the mediatorial method itself; and more with the immoral influence of conscription upon the manhood of his native land than with the authority of popes and councils. Both were Romanists who, at the outset, were in disagreement with the church only upon a question of abuse. Neither had an idea as to where his steps would eventually lead him. Neither felt that he was doing anything which contravened fundamental Roman teaching. It was only after their protest brought them into prolonged contention with the ecclesiastical authorities that their eyes were opened, and they made the long step away from Rome,—and then, only after her anathemas had forever closed her doors against the reformers.

Neither Luther nor Zwingli was a systematic theologian in the strict sense of the term. For their reformation, at first, was one in church practices only. Theology did not greatly interest them then. But both were supremely interested in religion, as it directly concerned the individual sinner. When Luther entered the sphere of technical theology he became somewhat dull. But when he attempted to answer the question of the Phillipian jailer, "What must I do to be saved?" he shook the religious world from center to circumference.

His conception of the religious life grew out of his own personal experience. He had received practically no early theological training. He but held the current popular opinions and superstitions. Very early in his career a great fear of God's wrath had driven him into the monastery of Erfurt where he diligently performed all the rites and practices his monastic superiors prescribed. Through these works of merit he tried to *earn* salvation and peace. He wanted that internal assurance which is a guarantee that one is in safe hands. Then

after days and weeks of weary and altogether fruitless effort, the conviction—which was not new with him, but which St. Paul had voiced nearly fifteen centuries prior to Luther's time—dawned upon him that “the uproad to peace lay in repudiating all righteousness of his own and depending for salvation wholly upon God's grace in Jesus Christ.” Roman theology had always taught the forgiving grace of God in Christ and the uselessness of independent human effort. But the church had also and always insisted that God's grace and love could and must be mediated only by the church herself. Now Luther was singularly innocent of this teaching of the church, and he placed his emphasis altogether upon God's wrath against the sinner. Hence, when he experienced God's forgiveness, without the necessity of human mediation, he believed himself to be in no way diverging from the theology of Rome, and for a few years was at peace within the bosom of the church. But his prolonged controversy with her over the matter of indulgences taught him that she was irrevocably committed to the system he was attacking. His subsequent break with the church was inevitable.

Luther's starting point, as was the case with nearly all the reformers, was the nature of God and the depravity of man. God is an angry deity who demands perfect righteousness and obedience from man. His wrath must be placated before man can live in peace. But that is rendered impossible because of man's innate corruptness. Luther's experience had taught him the emptiness of works, and the way of the law had failed him ingloriously. His sin, however, troubled him always, not because of its essentially evil nature, but solely because of the wrath of God it entailed. His only way to escape divine wrath was to throw himself upon divine mercy. That he learned from a close study of the Pauline literature. “There is no one,” he writes, “who would not prefer to be without righteousness than without the grace of God.” The peace of heart which resulted from this self-surrender Luther interpreted as salvation itself,—*i. e.*, salvation from God's

wrath. And salvation he considered an instantaneous transaction. The Christian life he, therefore, regarded as the effect of salvation, and not as its condition, as did the average Romanist. Luther had tried the way of works, but it had not granted him the certainty of salvation,—and certainty is the great *desideratum* of the devout soul. Only the repudiation of any merit of his own and complete surrender to the living and loving God through Christ had granted Luther certainty that he was a saved man. He felt himself released from the divine disfavor and enjoying God's favor. Divine forgiveness is the heart of Luther's conception of salvation.

There is one condition, however, upon which forgiveness is granted, and that is *faith*. "The just shall live by faith" was the battle cry of St. Paul against the Judaizers, and it became the cry of the reformer against the Romanists. But here it may be objected, faith is pre-eminently a human act, and forgiveness which rests upon faith must in some way after all be connected with human merit. This is what the typical orthodox churchman maintained, though he went one step further, and elevated works to the level of faith,—*"faith and works."* From that Luther violently dissented. "Faith, too, is the work of God," he declared. In Jesus Christ God reveals himself as the gracious Father to that man who is conscious of his sin, and who desires to be cleansed. The divine law furnishes him the vision of his need, Jesus Christ offers the assurance of pardon, the man surrenders himself, and faith forthwith follows. "That he believes is no merit of his own. It is because God has shown Himself a gracious Father in whom he cannot help believing." The revelation is God's; faith is simply man's instinctive response to the revelation.

The Christian life which follows upon the assurance of pardon is, according to Luther, a life of perfect liberty. "A Christian man is the most free of all, and subject to none," he asserted. He who trusts himself to the gracious God revealed in Jesus is already a saved man, and has no more need

to work out his salvation with fear and trembling. For fear is no longer a motive for work; love takes its place as the dynamic of the Christian life. Having been set free from the fear which impels one to work only for one's own salvation, the Christian man can now give himself up unreservedly to the service of his fellows. His whole life is sanctified by his faith. The distinction between sacred and secular passes away,—all is sacred. The commonest vocation is made holy, for the Christian is serving God through the media of the commonest tasks. Because he is already a saved man, his life on earth is just as sacred as the life in heaven. "No Christian," he writes, "should despise his position and life, if he is living in accordance with the will of God; but should say, 'I believe in Jesus Christ, and do as the Ten Commandments teach, and pray that our dear Lord God may help us thus to do.'"

This idea of Christian freedom, however, was fatal to the ecclesiastical supremacy in two chief respects. First, it liberated men from the domination of the Roman penitential system. Of course men had cut themselves loose from the authority of the church before Luther's day; but they had been able to do so only by utterly repudiating the whole religious system and becoming irreligious freelances. But Luther bade the sincere penitent throw himself upon the tender mercies of his God as revealed in Christ; when that was done, then the works performed under the direction of the church, and submission to her dictation in things moral and intellectual, or spiritual, became inoperative for him. The individual could free himself from the Roman Church and still be a Christian,—an idea almost unheard-of before the first half of the sixteenth century. Secondly, Luther's conception of Christian liberty broke down the unnatural distinction between clergy and laity, which had existed for so many centuries, and dignified the so-called common man. The faithful shoemaker is as precious in God's sight as the monastic celibate. One calling is as praiseworthy as another, for its value

is determined by its relation to this life rather than to the future. God wants faithful children, whether they be tradesmen, peasants or clergymen. In fact, that man who lives a virile Christian life in the busy marts of the world is, if anything, more faithful than the monk who runs away from the world to save himself in his own isolated cell. "Christian freedom" became the magic word which toppled over both Roman authority and the sanctity of monastic institutions. But it also became the catchword of those who were unable to distinguish between the limitations of true liberty and the excesses of license.

As far as the church was concerned, Luther's attitude was not at first openly antagonistic. It was only her oppressive tyranny and her brazen claims which received his castigation. As one of the means of grace he heartily endorsed her; but as the sole means of grace he repudiated her. He considered the proclamation of Jesus' Gospel of grace the indispensable condition of salvation, because it stirs up faith. "One thing, and only one," he said, "is necessary for life, justification, and Christian liberty, and that is the most holy word of God, the gospel of Christ." "The soul can do without everything except the word of God, without which none at all of its wants is provided for." As a sacramental institution dispensing saving grace, the church lost her significance for Luther; but as a community of true believers, as the "communion of saints," engaged in the preaching of the "word," she became most significant. "Whoever would find the Christ," he stated, "must find the church. The church is not wood, nor stone, but the mass of people who believe in Christ. To them one must turn and see how they believe, live and teach, who certainly have Christ with them. For outside of the Christian church is no truth, no Christ, no salvation." By this, however, Luther did not mean to imply that there is no salvation outside of any particular institution, for he considered the church invisible and spiritual; but that God saves men by His word, which is known and proclaimed only where

there are Christian believers. The church is a saving community, not because she conveys grace sacramentally, but because she teaches men of forgiveness. The preaching of the word is the mark of the true church; the sacraments are simply the signs of the word. And thus arises the ancient protestant conception that the marks of the true church are "the word and the sacraments."

Zwingli and Calvin differed somewhat from the German reformer in their conception of both salvation and the church. According to the former, salvation is more or less dependent upon the idea of predestination which rests primarily upon the nature of God. He is the only active being in the universe; not merely the "first cause," but the only cause. Not only the deeds of men, but their destinies are predetermined by the Almighty. Some He foreordains to eternal life that He may display His mercy; some to eternal death that He may manifest His justice,—and both for the sake of His own glory. In the view of the Swiss reformers, election is the ground of salvation, and faith is merely the badge of election. Christian liberty, if there really was a place for such an idea in their system of thought, meant merely release from human enactments in religious affairs. Both regarded religion as consisting in the worship of God and doing His will. But in our study of their theology, we can scarcely refrain from questioning the religious value of such worship and obedience, when one's salvation or condemnation has already been predetermined.

The church was a broader term in their view than it was to Luther. The church constituted the "totality of the elect," including both heathen and Christians, adults and infants, all whom God had predestined to salvation "for the sake of His own glory." The Bible was valuable to the church, not especially because it contained the message of God's forgiveness,—for that found very little recognition in the theology of Calvin and Zwingli,—but rather because therein is revealed the divine will which constitutes the legal code of the Christian, and obedience to which forms the essence of Christianity.

In their controversy with the Roman Church it soon became apparent that the reformers needed some strong authority to provide a sound basis for their new teaching. The Romanist naturally turned to tradition and the decisions of the councils and popes for the source of his authority. But the reformers turned to Scripture. Wiclif and Huss had long before appealed to the Bible as a sufficient warrant for their constructive reforms; and even the Humanists were not too radically progressive to consider the Bible an ultimate court of appeals for their criticism of a corrupt church. So the reformers pitted an infallible Bible against an infallible church. Not that they needed an infallible external authority for themselves, but because their own irreconcilable opposition to the Roman Church and the serious nature of their work demanded an authority more weighty than their own *ipse dixit*. Luther's own experience had led him to handle the Bible in the freest possible manner. He did not regard Scripture, as a whole, an unconditional authority, but only that part of it which he recognized as most clearly proclaiming the message of forgiveness. Some books, he found, gave clearer expression to it than others, though that did not prevent him from calling the Bible, as a whole, in traditional language, "the word of God." Certain portions of Scripture, like the Gospel according to St. John, I Peter, and the Pauline epistles, he prized most highly. But the letter of James he termed an "epistle of straw," while the Apocalypse he declared utterly worthless. But the more he used the Bible, the more he found his spiritual life nourished by it, so that eventually his early distinction between the Gospel of forgiveness and Scripture passed away, and in time was altogether forgotten by his followers. The "word of God," the "Gospel," and "Bible" became synonymous terms, and all parts were lifted to the same level of inspiration, endowed with equal weight and authority. Moreover, Christian teaching was placed on the same plane, notwithstanding the fact that much of it was spun purely from the human reason by the early church fathers who used

Scripture chiefly as a proof-text. Thus, following the first decade of the reformation, *orthodoxy* became the criterion of the Christian life, and as a logical result, Servetus was burned at the stake, and a host of others were persecuted and exiled. Luther could not consider Zwingli a Christian "for he holds and teaches no article of faith rightly." He even advocated the use of force by the state against those who taught differently. In common with the other reformers, he forgot that Christian liberty upon which he was so insistent early in his career, and adopted a doctrinal position which in time became as narrow as that of the Romanist. Therefore, one of the very elements which protestantism had gained for the whole Christian world,—the right of the individual Christian to test all doctrine for himself, and to believe as his experience of God's grace had taught him,—was crushed by the identical party which had given it birth. Protestantism had gained freedom from ecclesiastical bondage, only to be plunged into a doctrinal bondage of its own making,—and of a still more depressing character. The old protestantism had failed in its attempt to set the Christian man free. And this, now, is the pre-eminent task of the new protestantism.

Twentieth century protestantism differs materially from that of the sixteenth century in its conception of salvation, the church, and the Bible, in our study of which we secure a new idea of authority.

As we have seen, Luther regarded salvation as primarily the assurance of release from the fear of God's wrath by voluntary self-surrender. His idea of God, before his spiritual awakening, did not differ essentially from that of the Jews prior to the advent of Jesus. Calvin and Zwingli thought of God as a ruler who arbitrarily appoints men to life or death as it pleases Him. Faith is simply the mark of a pre-ordained career.

But we have a different idea of salvation, to-day,—and more ethical—just because we have a different conception of

God. We have interpreted the idea of God according to the teaching of Jesus, and we declare that He is not an angry nor an egotistical deity who consigns some men to life and some to death "for His own glory,"—for we fail to understand how arbitrariness can glorify God,—but that He is the Father whose infinite love prompts Him to make the greatest sacrifice to win His children from the entanglements of *sin*; that He does it freely and gladly. Thus salvation is interpreted in terms of sin, and not in terms of wrath or hell. "He shall save His people from their sins," said the angelic messenger to the enraptured Joseph. The parable of "the prodigal son" shows us the very heart of the Father, patient, long-suffering, forgiving. And every article of the faith must square itself with John 3:16 before the new protestantism will admit it into its theological system. Furthermore divine love is conceived to be universal in its scope. That word "whosoever," in John 3:16, throws down the bars of a limited atonement, and permits him who will to drink of the water of life freely. It is only a rigid scholasticism, which argues from a misconception of God's nature, which is able to impose such an impossible idea upon the world as a *predestinatio duplex*. Even Calvin, who enunciated the doctrine most clearly, revolted from the conclusion which his logical mind had reasoned out from a false premise. And yet upon the conclusion itself he unswervingly insisted.

If theology of this century admits any theory of predestination whatever into its system, it is that which we scientifically postulate as the groundwork of the personal life: heredity, environment and the will. The Lord determines through the operation of the law of heredity just what traits and tendencies one shall receive from his ancestors; He determines the environment into which one shall be born; and then,—and this is most important,—He gives one a will, and says: "work out your salvation with fear and trembling." The will, reinforced by intellectual training and spiritual culture, is able by the grace of God to surmount the limitations of a godless heredity or

blighting environment, and create for itself a character after God's own heart.

The church, likewise, is thought of in a slightly different light from that of the reformers of the sixteenth century. We have taken Luther's "community of believers" and Zwingli's "totality," and united them in the definition that the church is the totality of believers who constitute a spiritual organism with Jesus Christ as the head and organizing principle, for the express purpose of bringing the kingdom of God upon earth. The church is therefore neither as comprehensive nor as narrow a term as Zwingli's "totality of elect"; nor is she as intangible and invisible as the other reformers considered her. In fact the modern age has torn away much of her mystical trappings, and imputes to her a more ethical character. It is true she still has her creeds and doctrines, as every organization must have to greater or lesser degree; but her sole interest is not now centered in her creed, but rather in the practical application of her creed to everyday life. "Right living" flowing out of "right thinking" is the dominant note of the modern age. It charges him with the gravest heresy who, notwithstanding his orthodoxy in matters of Christian faith, does not square his life with his thinking,—and in respect to life, we today know of only one criterion: "that ye love one another."

But it is in the matter of authority that the new protestantism has far outdistanced the old. The day of authority has not passed away, it is true, but the modern age has postulated a new seat, and that is *the Christian consciousness of the individual believer*. The inner conviction of the Christian heart is the highest court of appeals. This was Luther's own idea when he began his work. It was the theory of all the reformers by inference rather than by explicit statement. Four hundred years ago, Luther declared that "it is a wickedly devised fable for the pope alone to interpret the scriptures, or to confirm the interpretation of them. We are all priests and have all one faith, one gospel, one sacrament; how then should we not have

the power of discerning and judging what is right and wrong in matters of faith?" And to the pope he wrote: "they are in error who attribute to you alone the right of interpreting scripture." Now these words can mean only one thing: that not only to Luther, but to the individual Christian himself is accorded the right of interpretation and judgment, by virtue of his prophethood, priesthood and kingship. But Luther very early withdrew this self-evident right from his followers. The "prophets of Zwickau," the peasant wars, and the Anabaptist horrors of Münster caused him to react from his former liberalistic position to the extreme conservative, and then the mediæval tendency of his mind asserted itself. The reformers were either fearful of the forces they had set in motion, and of the spirit they had evoked, or they had not reasoned out to its logical conclusion their attitude toward Scripture and the Roman Church. Instead of setting the church completely free from the trammels of an empty traditionalism by attempting to discover the nature of authority itself, they made the mistake, which was fatal to the spirit of protestantism, of insisting upon an authority *external* to oneself. And thus they betrayed the fact that they were still largely Catholic.

We say they made a mistake, for an authority which must in the nature of the case be external and objective is simply a confession that the truth is too weak to verify itself in Christian experience, and that the Christian man is unable to use his moral judgment aright. Of what personal value, we ask, is truth, when it must appeal to an objective authority for its credentials? Of what purpose is man's moral judgment itself, if its conclusions cannot be depended upon as trustworthy, but must always be overruled by a superimposed authority, whether it be of the church or the *ipsissima verba* of the Scriptures themselves? This can be only simon-pure Romanism of the most flagrant sort. Both the reformers' own free use of Scripture and their emphatic opposition to the Roman Church are sufficient warrant for the modern protestant to translate authority in terms of the spiritual intuitions of the Christian.

For external authority always presupposes an intermediary between man and the truth,—an idea which Luther discovered in his own experience, and the necessity for which he vigorously denied. On the other hand, Christian freedom and the moral constitution of man imply an immediate, direct contact of consciousness with truth. “Reason,” said Bishop Butler, “is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge anything, even religion itself.” We estimate the value of all literature, of everything, by our subjective judgment, and shall we not do the same with Scripture, or with dogma? For genuine dogma must be invested with moral certainty before it can be acceptable to the Christian consciousness. Of course there is such a reality as the consensus of moral judgment which in time crystallizes into a creed or an official dogma. But even that must be interpreted by the individual before it has any real validity for him. And it must be verified by his own experience before it becomes true to him. Any creed or doctrine which is impossible of such verification has no essential place in our theological system. “He that willeth to do God’s will shall know of the doctrine” still remains the valid test of all religious truth.

Moreover, this is the test which Scripture itself suggests. Only an infallible Bible is able to demand an implicit acceptance of dogma. But the Bible nowhere lays claims to infallibility. That is the fiction which the early reformers read into it, to serve as a counter claim against that of the Roman Church. An infallible Bible necessarily demands an infallible interpreter and interpretation,—just the argument which Rome used against Luther, and one which can scarcely be refuted. But we know that in all written or printed words there is more or less ambiguity. No one is able to render an absolutely correct meaning of the printed page,—correct in the sense that it represents accurately and in every detail the exact thought the writer had in mind when he penned the words. And no more than that can be said of the printed pages of Scripture. Just what do they mean to tell us; and who shall interpret their

message for us? Again, we must fall back upon the Christian consciousness of the reader for the answer. We know that all men are fallible to a greater or less degree. The "men of old wrote as they were able," and men today translate their writings as they are able. Now had God intended giving us an infallible book to serve as the final source of authority, He would have caused one to be written about whose every shade of meaning there could be no possibility of a doubt. The fact that He has not done so,—for every sect finds its own meaning within its pages,—leads us to infer that God did not need an infallible book to constitute the credential for His truth. For truth is able to be its own credential to that Christian who follows the guidance of the Holy Spirit into the deeper reaches of the truth. But an infallible Bible would obviate the necessity of an everpresent Spirit, for all that men would otherwise need would be, "what saith the scripture?" When they had once discovered its declaration, their course would be clear. However the strictly human element in both writer and interpreter renders both an infallible writing and an infallible interpretation psychologically impossible.

And the Bible itself bears witness to this fact. In our study of it, we find it occasionally contradicting itself, or voicing sentiments which are inconsistent with "the mind of the Master," and with our best ethical judgments. Thus we find that Aaron died at two different places, Num. 33:38, Deut. 10:6, and Judas in two different modes, Mat. 27:5, Acts 1:18. Again, the creation stories in the first and second chapters of Genesis are mutually inconsistent and no manner of exegesis can harmonize them. Ch. 1 states that man was created last in the order of animal creation, as the crown of creation; ch. 2 declares that God created man before any other animal, and that woman was apparently an afterthought. Now which story shall we accept as correct? But this question in itself seriously threatens the integrity of the ancient claim of biblical infallibility. For there ought to be no possibility of a choice between two statements of a book concerning the same

event, when the book itself is presumed to be the authority for all choices. Infallibility implies only one undeniable meaning and one choice. Now which story shall we accept as the truth? And what will be the basis of our choice? Ought someone else make the decision for us, or shall we make it for ourselves? The reformers of the sixteenth century denied the right of decision to the church; on the other hand, the Bible does not pretend to render a decision for us. There is then only one other alternative: we, as individual Christians, must decide for ourselves, subject to the light which the ages and modern science have thrown upon the question. This fitness of individual judgment we have already recognized in the sphere of pure reason and science. Shall we not in all consistency grant it in the sphere of theology? For there is and should be nothing inherently different in the methods which geology and theology use in arriving at the truth. Both must use their reason and experience, and all the means at their disposal, in reaching a relatively correct conclusion. But science recognizes no authority external to itself, and shall less be said of the *Christian* scientist, when Christian truth, or doctrine, is the point under discussion? In the past such a question was taboo, because the faith of the church rested upon the idea that the Bible was an infallible book, vested with exclusive authority upon all conceivable subjects. And yet it is a very reasonable question which the church today dare not deny the Christian under pain of being untrue to the truth itself.

But we find in the Bible, also, occasional sentiments expressed which violate our best ethical judgments. Consider, for example, the Imprecatory Psalms, in which the writer calls down the direst vengeance of the Almighty upon the heads of his enemies; or, in Israel's early history, the wars of extermination in which men, women and children were ruthlessly destroyed in obedience to a presumably divine mandate; or Jael's cruelty to Sisera, apparently with God's approval, and with the commendation of the prophetess Deborah; or the ferocious cruelty of Jews to Persians, in Esther. Now how shall we

think of these sentiments and incidents? Were we to find them in any other literature than the Bible we would frankly call them by their right name, and condemn them. But shall we palliate them just because they are found in our sacred Scriptures? That was the attitude men formerly took, for they considered the Bible to be God's final word to men, inerrant in all its parts; whatever it said was right, because it was the "word of God" which said it. Thus they were able to damn their fellows, and wickedly to destroy "witches,"—and all "for the glory of God." For in the past five hundred years men believed they had no moral judgment comparable with even the most commonplace portions of Scripture. Whatever it said upon any subject was sufficient warrant for them to act upon.

Today, however, we emphatically dissent from such a position. We accord to the Christian the same right to use his moral as his rational judgment. That right is to be used in dealing with biblical statements as with any other. For the Bible is a sacred and precious book to us, not by reason of any theory we hold as to its origin, inspiration, or infallibility, *but because of its innate lofty spiritual character and tone*, which inspire us with a desire to fashion for ourselves a like character. We see in Scripture the manner in which God slowly, patiently, and persistently led His people out of darkness into light, from lower to ever higher ethical levels of life. But Scripture itself is simply the written record of that process, with the end on a far higher spiritual plane than the beginning; between the two limits there is much that is unmoral and unethical. And upon that we have the right to pass judgment. Our modern view will not permit us to believe that God endorses in one age what He forbids in a later; or that He in His perfection approves what we in our imperfection condemn as unethical. He is the same yesterday, today and forever. It is we who change. When we therefore find any statement in Scripture, or event, which seems to have the approval of God, but which we are unable to harmonize with our concep-

tion of Him as a loving Father, then our moral sense tells us that that apparent approval was the result of a misconception men held of the divine nature. But to say that is, again, to question the inerrancy of Scripture, and to affirm the authority and ability of the individual Christian intuition. What after all is the intuition but immediate knowledge which needs no other authority than its own *ipse dixit*? And spiritual intuition is simply direct knowledge in things spiritual and moral, due to the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the mind and heart of the Christian. By virtue of our faith we depend upon the culturing power of the Spirit for progressive enlightenment upon spiritual problems, and for the formation of a right moral judgment. But we are expected to use that judgment as the occasion offers, whether it be in things biblical, or philosophically ethical. If we believe that Jesus meant just what He said when He promised to send us the Holy Spirit who would lead us into all truth, then we must believe that we are today under the Spirit's tutelage in the formation of our Christian conviction. But this, now, implies another aid to the development of our moral sense, in addition to Scripture. This implies, also, that God's last word has not been spoken to men with the closing of the canon, but that He is still speaking to men, and is creating in men that spiritual insight into, and direct knowledge of, the truth by means of which they are to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." But to locate final authority in the Bible, or in any other objective place, rather than in the inner spirit of man, is to separate God from His world, is to deny the inspirational power and leadership of the Spirit in the "community of believers," and is to destroy that confidence which men ought to have in their moral judgment by virtue of their creation in the similitude of God, so that they become little more than irrational and unmoral automatons.

It is of course true that all authority must be centered in Jesus Christ in the last analysis, for the Christ-character is the only standard for ethics, and the Christ-teaching the only test

for doctrine. But this recalls our original question: who shall tell us just what His character is, and what is His teaching? To assert that we find both in the New Testament is to confess that we need an interpreter for both. For the evangelists each give us a somewhat different aspect of His character, and a different conception of His teaching. Who shall syncretize the pictures of his personality, and harmonize the details of his teaching, or fuse them into a consistent whole? Again, we answer: the individual Christian, as he is guided in his study by the Holy Spirit. Not every man, indeed, is fitted to pass judgment upon the real meaning of the Master's words; only the sincere truth-seeker, as he puts aside all preconceptions and prejudices, and uses his moral sense under the guidance of the Spirit, is in a position to speak in any way authoritatively upon those teachings, or upon the verity of ecclesiastical doctrine.

This Christian freedom, unfettered by tradition, or council, or any external authority, the early reformers claimed for themselves, though they in time reacted from it. And this Christian freedom the modern protestant claims for himself. For Christian thought was not finished with the interpretation which the evangelists and apostles put upon the words and personality of Jesus Christ. But Christian thought only had its beginning with their interpretation. It remains the work of the faithful modern disciple to take up the work where these early "men of God" laid it down. And only as men use their powers and intuitions under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in testing truth, dogma, doctrine, will they be free from the fallible enactments of institutionalism, from the variable moral tone of objective authority, and enter into that perfect autonomy which Jesus confers upon all those who follow Him.

McKEESPORT, PA.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

SOCIALISM: PROMISE OR MENACE? By Morris Hillquit and John Augustine Ryan. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1914. Price \$1.25.

During the past year an interesting and important series of articles on the right and wrong of Socialism has appeared in *Everybody's Magazine*. These articles are popular in style and in form a debate between two eminent and able disputants. Dr. Ryan is a Roman Catholic priest and an excellent representative of that church, which above all others has long warred against Socialism, and which now more than ever is engaged in a systematic and concerted attack on socialist doctrines. He is Professor of Moral Theology and Economics at St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., and is, therefore, well qualified by his attainments as well as by his ability to prosecute the case against Socialism, since the issues involved in the modern socialist movement are mainly, if not exclusively, economic and ethical in character. Mr. Hillquit is a Russian by birth and an American by adoption, a practising lawyer in New York City, the author of several well known works on Socialism, and closely identified with the socialist movement on its official side. He has been a delegate to every national socialist convention since 1899, and has represented the United States at the international congresses at Amsterdam, Stuttgart and Copenhagen. He is probably the foremost representative of American Socialism, and is entitled to speak with authority, not only on the socialist movement as it is found in the United States, but also on the larger international movement. These articles, with slight revisions, have now been put into book form to meet the popular demand for a clear and concise and yet comprehensive statement of the *pros* and *cons* of Socialism.

The disputants agree in taking a comprehensive view of Socialism. For both it is three distinct things: a philosophy, an end, and a means; or a body of doctrine, a scheme of social organization, and an active political movement. Armed with this comprehensive chart the disputants range over the entire field of socialist thought, and employ every sort of weapon within reach, whether philosophic, historic, scientific, economic, ethical or religious. The five chapters of the book, exclusive of the introduction and summary, deal with the indictment and defense of the present industrial order, the merits and demerits of the proposed socialist industrial state, the philosophy of Socialism, the moral implications of Socialism, and the attitude of Socialism towards religion.

The particular brand of Socialism which Mr. Hillquit champions is that represented by the present-day international socialist movement, which claims the allegiance of the vast majority of professed socialists throughout the world, and which is essentially the Socialism of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and Ferdinand Lassalle, with its theory of surplus value, its doctrine of economic determinism, and its philosophy of the class struggle. To be sure, this Marxian Socialism has been modified to some extent to meet changing social conditions or a larger economic knowledge, as well as to disarm hostile critics. But the modifications are modifications, not of principle, but of detail and method. On this point, which it is necessary constantly to emphasize, Hillquit has the following to say: "The international socialist movement is still Marxian, because the fundamental social and economic doctrines of Karl Marx, his collaborators and disciples, still hold good in the eyes of the vast majority of socialists."

The debate is conducted with consummate ability and skill and rare good temper. It is a real contribution to the rapidly growing body of socialist literature, and is well worth the attention of all who would know both sides of a pressing public problem.

A. V. HIESTER.

PENNSYLVANIA, THE KEYSTONE—A SHORT HISTORY. By Samuel Whitaker Pennypacker, Governor of the Commonwealth, 1903-1907. Christopher Sower Co. \$1.00 net.

This work gives in outline the history of Pennsylvania. It is based in large part upon original materials preserved in the Library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania never before utilized. Few men are so well qualified by long special study and by exceptional advantages of talent and temperament to prove the unequalled influence of Pennsylvania in American affairs, as is ex-Governor Pennypacker.

The first half of this volume takes up the story of the Commonwealth from the days of the Indians and the early settlers to the administration of Governor Tener. The second half treats the subject topically—rather than chronologically. The writer discusses the relation of Pennsylvania to Literature, Science, Invention, Art, Medicine, Law, Education, Iron and Coal, Industries and Transportation, Religion, Romance, Poetry.

The special features which the author brings out to establish the unequalled position of Pennsylvania in American life are found in the following facts. David Lloyd, in a Philadelphia Court, defied the King 75 years before the speech of Patrick Henry in the House of Burgesses in Virginia. The centre of the position of the French, in the French and Indian War, was at Fort Duquesne and it was to that point that the British armies were directed. John Dickinson presented the principles on which the War of the Revolution was fought and its battles in the main were

fought around Philadelphia. Pennsylvania conducted the finances of the Wars of the Revolution, 1812 and the Rebellion. The career of George Washington was essentially a Pennsylvania career. The anti-slavery movement began in Pennsylvania. The literary career of James Ralph was the most conspicuous in the colonial era. Pennsylvania supported the Louisiana Purchase. Anthony Wayne conducted the successful war which won the West for civilization. Pennsylvania took the first steps upon the part of the North in the War of the Rebellion and her troops were the first to reach the National Capital when threatened. Pennsylvania has paid for all of her public improvements and is out of debt.

This volume ought to be in the hands of every school boy and citizen in the Commonwealth. It is written in simple style; it has all the qualities of a romance. If the three distinct functions of history are, as has been said, the scientific, the imaginative or speculative, and the literary, we may well say that Mr. Pennypacker proves himself in this volume to be an historian of whom the state may well be proud. For he is scientific, he has accumulated facts and sifted evidence; he appeals to the imagination when he deals with the facts he has gathered, selects and classifies them, and from them draws his generalizations. Last of all he places his exposition of the results of science and imagination in a form that attracts by its simple, literary quality. We predict that this volume will have a wide sale. It deserves a place in the public schools of the State.

Mr. Pennypacker's book is published by the Christopher Sower Company, of Philadelphia, an establishment which began to print in 1738, from which date it has had continuous existence. The volume before us is well printed and beautifully illustrated and reflects credit on publisher as well as author.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE RURAL CHURCH MOVEMENT. By Edwin L. Earp, Ph.D. (Leipzig), Professor of Sociology, Drew Theological Seminary. The Methodist Book Concern. \$0.75 net.

The rural church movement offers one of the most fruitful fields for the student of sociology to be found in modern times. We counted no less than twelve new books on this subject in a recent exhibit of church literature. Up to within a year ago the conditions and problems of city life formed the chief subject for discussion on the part of students of Christian sociology. Authors and journalists generally resided in cities or large towns and wrote about the experiences which immediately affected them. Social problems until very recent times were supposed to be only those of huge aggregations of population. So with the church, home mission policy and home mission activities were largely confined to the city.

To-day writers of sociology and students of religion are placing a new emphasis on the country-life problem. This may be due to the fact that in more recent times the improvement of conditions in the country has in general become the object of more general interest. The report of the Commission on Country Life appointed by the President of the United States only a few years ago lifted the whole rural domain into the consciousness of the American people. Surveys were made in different regions. Questions of soil and water and forest were discussed. To-day the rural problem is seen to be not only an economic and political but also a moral and religious question. It is seen that the vast rural domain is the resource field in the nation's life in more than a material sense.

The volume before us lays stress on the need of the best trained spiritual leaders for the open country. The writer believes there is no field for life investment in the real issues of the Kingdom of God on earth so promising of results to the man who wants to deal in "big futures" as that of the church in the open country, because it contains one half the population of our nation, and without intending a reflection upon any other part of the national household, he thinks, the better half. He believes that the entire rural church movement ought to become thoroughly organized on an intelligent cooperative basis in social sympathy.

The volume treats of (1) The Open Country, (2) The Call for Leadership, (3) The Kind of Leadership Required, (4) Factors that Make Such Leaders, (5) Life Investment in the Open Country.

In his discussion of the open country the author shows that in only six of the forty-eight states of the Union was there a decrease in rural population during the last decade, while eight increased in rural population over 50 per cent.; six from 30 to 50 per cent.; two from 20 to 30 per cent.; ten from 10 to 20 per cent. The value of farm property for the same period increased over 100 per cent.

The author finds that the factors entering into a great spiritual leader in the rural life movement are (1) a chance to express the impulse to achieve; (2) ability to sense and perceive human need; (3) a constructive imagination; (4) engineering skill in avoiding friction; (5) a persistent purpose to win in a good cause. Leadership for rural problems is being developed to-day by colleges of agriculture, by theological seminaries, by the rural department of the Y. M. C. A., by the Department of Agriculture and by the Department of Public Education. Sunday-school leaders and home mission boards are also making special efforts to meet the problem.

"The rural-mindedness of the prophets and of Jesus" forms the attractive title of one of the chapters of this very interesting

book. It is a sort of scriptural background for rural study. "The Spiritual Conquest of the Germanic Peoples a Rural Achievement" covers the pre-Reformation, the Reformation and the modern rural movement in Germany. "The Rural Church and the Pioneer Period in America" treats of the character and function of the pioneer preacher. "The Period of Rural Church Decline" is a treatment of the period from 1870 to 1900. The cause of decline was the rapid growth of industrialism and the resultant urban movement; the inadequate rural ministry, and the urbanized education from the log school house to the theological seminary.

The writer then shows how the past decade has brought to men an awakening interest in country life, and how this interest is being brought to the consciousness of the people as a whole and is being placed upon a scientific basis. Economic facts were the dynamic of this awakening movement: viz., phenomenal growth of towns, increased cost of living in the actual food products of the farms, enormous profits of middle man. The book also discusses in a very practical way the question of the social center parish, of the rural Sunday-school and of the rural Bible class. The author's suggestions of a home missionary policy for rural districts are valuable. "I would like to see," he says, "several scholarships in the country church movement in all the synods for the use of picked young men to study the entire rural field under the direction of the theological seminaries of the church for the next five years, so that many of our best trained men may be led to choose deliberately their life ministry in the open country and thus help to make the rural life movement Christian, and help the church at large to work out a home missions and church extension policy that will adequately meet the problems of our vast rural domain in which dwell more than half the good people of our beloved country."

This volume on the whole is one of the best that has been written on the subject. It is simple, clear, scientific. It furnishes not only the history of a vital social and religious movement, but it presents the outstanding facts and methods that have been of value. It is a volume for the general reader, as well as for the special student.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF COL. JOHN SIEGFRIED. By Rev. John Baer Stoudt.
The Cement News Print, Northampton, Pa.

The author of this book is a minister of the Reformed Church who has taken an unusual interest in matters of local history. He has exceptional talent along lines of historic research. The articles written in the *Cement News* in 1912 and 1913 by Mr. Stoudt at-

tracted widespread interest and ripened into a proposition to erect a tablet to the memory of Col. John Siegfried, the friend of Washington and the founder of the town of Siegfried. The volume before us was prepared at the request of the Col. John Siegfried Memorial Committee and was issued in connection with the unveiling of the monument in the old Mennonite cemetery, May 30, 1914.

The volume deals entirely with eighteenth century Pennsylvania history. After giving an account of the work of the Lenni Lenape Indians, the founding of the Indian village of Hokendauqua, the Walking Purchase, the Indian Massacre of 1763 in Allen and Whitehall townships, the author takes up the very interesting question of the Mennonite settlement in the Siegfried community. This is perhaps the most valuable part of Mr. Stoudt's book. He shows how the Mennonites established a congregation in Siegfried's and erected a meeting house about 1760, but gradually withdrew from the community, joining their brethren in Lancaster County. The old Mennonite cemetery, known as Siegfried's burial plot, is one of Northampton's old landmarks. This is of special interest because Col. Siegfried was of Mennonite extraction, his ancestors having been among the first German emigrants to Pennsylvania. Col. Siegfried was more than a local figure. It was upon him that General Washington depended in matters pertaining to Northampton County during the campaign of 1777. The author gives an excellent account in the close of the volume of the part played by the soldiers of Northampton County in the days of the Revolution.

The author has exercised painstaking care in the gathering of facts. He has made a distinct contribution to local history. The book is well illustrated. We commend Mr. Stoudt for his work. He deserves the gratitude of his community and of all students of local history.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

PLAIN THOUGHTS ON FAITH AND LIFE. By Wellesley P. Coddington. Eaton and Mains, New York. Pages 225. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume contains a series of religious essays. It treats subjects as varied as Self-seeking, Religion and the Home, The Abiding Life, Loss of Conscience, Skepticism, Our Unconscious Faults. All the chapters are written with a view to showing what a man believes is of great consequence in the formation of his personal character. A man of positive character must have a positive faith. The author shows, however, that a positive Christian faith does not prohibit an open mind. Hinduism and Romanism teach that a thought of doubt is a thought of sin. Protestant Christianity recognizes the fact that God's revelations, both to the race and to the individual, have always been progressive. One must unlearn much before reaching the final truth. While faith has its

reasonable limitations in the realm of history and speculation, it yet finds some things settled. One may be really broad and liberal and progressive without casting overboard everything that is older than day before yesterday. The writer's thought is sane, his style is clear, direct, straightforward. His treatment of religious subjects is vital and interesting.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE ENLARGING CONCEPTION OF GOD. By Herbert Alden Youtz. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1914. Pages ix + 199. Price \$1.25.

A new book on the Conception of God is not apt to be classed among the best sellers. And in the past there have been very few books, dealing with that exalted theme, which merited a wide circulation, either for the substance or form of their contents. Those written by philosophers were nebulous speculations about a transcendent being that was incomprehensible, while those penned by theologians, too often, were dogmatic presentations of a deity that was irrational and unmoral. These ponderous tomes scarcely whet one's appetite for other books on the doctrine of God. They may still stimulate speculative minds, and they may still satisfy souls that feel constrained to sacrifice reason on the altar of their faith. But they do not minister to the vital interest or need of an age that adores the practical and exalts the rational.

This book, however, is of another kind. It compels the interest of intelligent readers from cover to cover. Its major premise is that the Christian God, and, indeed, the whole Christian religion, is thoroughly comprehensible and altogether rational. It quotes approvingly this saying of another: We have gone in these days so far after the fashion of the gospel for the simple and ignorant, that we have come nigh to the state of things where only the ignorant can take pleasure in the gospel which they sometimes hear. The neglected, and if I may use the detestable phrase, "unchurched" class, is very apt to be to-day the cultivated and thoughtful class, the intellectually and morally rich (p. 12). And its avowed purpose is to show that the great verities of evangelical faith, far from being imperiled or destroyed by honest thought and frank discussion, stand in supreme need of being "thought through" in order to their emancipation from explanations and definitions that paralyze and petrify them. "The best thought and culture in the service of the heart-values, the character-forces and the spiritual revelations of life,—this is the ideal of these essays."

The author pursues this ideal steadfastly through the six chapters of his book. Some of them are essays previously published; one is an address given before a Conference on Religion; the last is a sermon preached to students, and two of the chapters were written specifically for this volume to round out its thought. But

the composite origin of these assembled essays does not destroy the unity of the book. They form a coherent whole in premise, method and conclusion.

The first chapter, *The Enlarging Conception of God*, which gives the whole volume its title, maintains that "our best conception of a living God must root in contemporary thought and morality." The problem is not simply to rationalize our view of God by bringing it into harmony with the modern *Weltanschauung*, though that is of primary importance, but also to realize, as it were, this rational God in our daily life as its constant inspiration and ultimate goal. The second chapter is entitled, *The Problem of Theological Method*. Here we have a fine and full statement of the "fundamental contrast between traditional and modern theological method," a contrast resulting from the transition from the static to the evolutionary conception of the universe. This chapter should be read first. It really touches the root of the whole matter. Here is the parting of the way that leads directly to an enlarging conception of God. Ultimately, the difference between theologies old and new is methodological. When men grant the legitimacy of the genetic method in the precinct of religion and theology, a new conception of God and a restatement of every other doctrine of the Christian faith result with logical necessity.

In chapters three and four the author presents, respectively, *The Justification of the Method* and *The Consequences of the Method*. The modern method of theological study is vindicated by an appeal to the sciences of philology, epistemology, and psychology. Language, the nature of knowledge, and human personality are the vital factors in any attempt of theological interpretation. And the sciences that deal with these factors are marshaled in support of the genetic method. The consequences of this new method are stated succinctly in our altered conception of creeds, the Bible, and Christ.

The superscription of the fifth chapter, *The Peril of a Safe Theology*, seems almost like a flash of grim humor in a serious book. But it embodies a deep insight into the nature of things spiritual, and it sounds a warning to those whose religious safety rests upon the crumbling pillars of external guarantees. God has provided no automic safety devices for the human soul in its quest of truth. It cannot place its trust in papal infallibility or in biblical inerrancy; for neither one nor the other exists. A really safe theology will not demand the blind acquiescence of reason in the name of faith. Rather, "it is one which faces the facts of life and their laws, and gives the profoundest account of them of which the mind is capable. It recognizes that the law of life is growth, and asks no other guarantee than that of faithful living and faithful thinking."

The last chapter, *The Truth About God: The Man Christ Jesus*, is a sermon preached to students, which seeks to approach the Divine through its self-manifestation in the human, which reached its efflorescence in Jesus Christ. The author calls it a "laboratory example" of the theological method expounded and advocated by him. It is a winsome statement of the majestic truth that the incarnation of God is not an afterthought of the Deity, an official device adopted by Him after the fall of man, but a necessity grounded in the divine nature. It is the gradual and progressive disclosure of the very essence of God, which is His moral and rational nature, through the medium of humanity.

Prof. Youtz has made a welcome addition to the class of books enumerated in the bibliography appended to the volume under review—books, which make for progress in religious interpretation. The significance of his contribution is disproportionate to its size. It is a small book on a "large God." It is heartily recommended, for their edification, to those who share the author's virile faith, and to all others for their emancipation from a theology which conceals the great realities of life which it professes to reveal.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE BEACON LIGHTS OF PROPHECY. By Albert C. Knudson. New York, The Methodist Book Concern, 150 Fifth Ave. Pages xii + 281. Price \$1.25 net.

The Beacon Lights of Prophecy discussed in this book are Amos, the prophet of Moral Law; Hosea, the prophet of Love; Isaiah, the prophet of Faith; Jeremiah, the prophet of Personal Piety; Ezekiel, the prophet of Individualism, and Deutero-Isaiah, the prophet of Universalism. The rediscovery of these great literary prophets of ancient Israel is one of the most gratifying results of the critical study of the Old Testament. Formerly they were regarded as men who predicted future events, and who authenticated their oracular messages by working miracles. They were remote figures shrouded in mystery and contemplated with awe. We believed in them because they were "in the Bible." But there was no real kinship between them and us. They remained strangers and foreigners even to the devout; and their difficult writings required much exegesis and still more apologetics.

The historical study of their literary monuments has wrought a surprising change. It has, indeed, destroyed the uncritical halo that formerly surrounded the prophets. We no longer regard them as oracles, or miracle-workers. But what they have lost in mystery and romance, has been more than counterbalanced by the corresponding gain in sober historical reality. They have been clothed with flesh and blood. We regard them as men like ourselves, but men who towered above their contemporaries by the

depth of their spiritual insight and by the fire and force of their moral passion. Formerly, we stood in awe of them, but they did not command our human interest. Now they thrill us with their mighty passion for righteousness. Their prophecies are charged with universal significance and their example is of perennial value. The messages of the greatest among them are as vital to-day, and their fearless proclamation is as imperative, as when they fell fresh from the lips of these heroic champions of Jehovah.

Professor Knudson essays to interpret these great prophetic messages for the preacher and layman, not the professional biblical scholar. But the latter will find everywhere the marks of competent scholarship. The author frankly, and for the most part tacitly, accepts the main conclusions of the modern critical study of the biblical documents. He has given special attention to the problem involved in the prophetic movement; and in one important respect, at least, he departs from the position generally held by experts. He maintains, with Gunkel, Gressmann, Sellin, and others, that from the time of Amos, and perhaps earlier, eschatology formed a vital element of the prophetic message. Accordingly, the prophets were not merely the social reformers of their age, who dealt with purely historical facts and forces. They recognized a superhistorical element in the fabric of the life of Israel,—“the transcendent power of the eternal Judge and Ruler of men.” And it was the bold proclamation of the coming of the day of Jehovah, as a day of punishment for Israel and as the inauguration of a new era for mankind, that gave the prophetic message its distinctive religious value.

The book is divided into seven chapters. The first contains a discussion of The History and Nature of Prophecy. It is simple in form and comprehensive in scope. We know no other book where, in brief compass, the intelligent layman could find a clearer account of the history of prophetism and a finer statement of its historical and universal importance. The following chapters are devoted to a description of the life and labor of the six great literary prophets. They are popular histories of men to whom the whole world owes a vast debt. Their characters are sketched with considerable literary skill, and their distinctive messages are set forth accurately and crisply.

We bespeak for the book a wide reading. It deserves a place on the shelves of Sunday-school libraries and in the homes of intelligent laymen. Books like this one, that are scholarly without being pedantic, and modern without being radical, will rescue the Old Testament from the popular neglect into which, it is to be feared, it has fallen. They will restore it to a commanding place among the small number of books that have permanently shaped the higher life of mankind.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1914.

I.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GERMANY.¹

A. LANG.

The most striking characteristic of present-day theological thought in Germany is that, for the moment, no single school is, either wholly or partially, in control of the situation. In the nineties, and even at the beginning of the present century, conditions were very different. At that time, the dogmatic branches and, to a great extent, Church History confined themselves within the lines laid down by *Albrecht Ritschl*. New Testament study was neglected to an amazing extent and, in Old Testament research, the *Wellhausian* theory was in control. To-day, the influence of both schools is on the wane. Not only the Ritschlian, but also the Wellhausian school is rapidly losing ground, even although the principles are still held, more or less independently, by well-known theologians. Up to the present,

¹ This article and the three following are the discourses delivered by the Rev. Professor A. Lang, D.D., of Halle, Germany, on the occasion of his recent visit to the United States, at various theological seminaries of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches, and at the Eighteenth Triennial Session of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, at Lancaster, Pa., May 12, 1914.

however, no theological movement has been able to attain to anything like the influential position formerly occupied by these two schools.

In order to understand how this change has come about, we must go into the matter with greater detail. In spite of symbolism in art and various other phenomena which are certainly eagerly pursuing a very different way, the greatest power in German intellectual life is still Realism. The present generation, like the last, centers its interest on that which actually exists. As a result, the term "scientific," in the strict sense of the word, is applied only to the exact sciences and to those, whose method guarantees that actual knowledge will be attained. All classes follow the progress of the natural sciences with the greatest possible interest. Among the other sciences, which we name "intellectual sciences" (*Geisteswissenschaften*), history, so closely related to the exact sciences in its method of research, is the most influential. Just as the devotee of natural science, from the height of present attainment, gazes into the future, hoping for fresh triumphs, even so do the representatives of nearly all the intellectual sciences gaze earnestly into the past. Historical questions are nearly everywhere to the fore. Especially is this true of theology. It seems as though the theologians were afraid to draw the material for a formulation of the Christian religion out of the present situation. Highly characteristic of present conditions is the method pursued by *Harnack* in his well-known "*Wesen des Christentums*," which has been translated into English under the title of "What is Christianity?" The book contains, not a biblical-theological or a dogmatic-philosophical treatment, but a sketch of the history of the Christian religion.

Not only this general characteristic of the scientific, but also the present religious situation in the German nation, exerts a very strong influence upon theological development. While, on the one hand, national and political life have been making tremendous strides; on the other hand, the church, from the very beginning, has never been able to develop inde-

pendent power either as a social bond or as a real force in the life of the nation. It was because of the close alliance between the Lutheran Church and the State, that in the nineteenth century, first the political movement of the middle class and then that of the laboring class saw in the Church, not a leader, but an enemy. As a result, disloyalty to the Church and a dislike and distrust for the Christianity of the Church and even of the Bible, have spread rapidly. This is true, in spite of the fact that the German people of to-day, like their forefathers, are by no means an irreligious folk. It is a well-known fact that the strongest of the German political parties, the social democratic, is based upon an outspoken materialism. Further a large section of the liberal party, even although they may not doubt the truth of the Christian religion, are quite out of touch with the Christianity of the Church.

Such a condition of affairs is bound to exert an influence upon scientific theology. It is true that the theological faculties have retained a position of honor in the various universities, so that even in Catholic Münster a new theological faculty is being established. The Church, however, must struggle for its existence, and theology feels itself responsible for the Church. As a result, there is a marked increase in apologetical tendencies. Thus the so frequently mentioned Hamburg preacher Hunsinger, formerly professor in Erlangen, places the apologetical motive in the very center of his systematic theology. The same tendency can be seen in the work of the "Keplerbund," an organization, grounded and conducted by theologians, which has attained splendid results. According to its programme, its object is to oppose the growth of materialism simply by means of the natural sciences. However, the materialism itself turned to a kind of new religion in the form of "Monism."

Monism is by no means a homogeneous system. Proceeding in the main from the Darwinist Haeckel of Jena and Ostwald of Leipzig, the chemical and physical scientist, it has developed a nature-philosophical movement. With its out-

spoken materialism and atheism it has united a religious tinge and even attempts to organize a kind of Church. In addition to the monists, there is a class of men, like Horneffer and Arthur Drews, who travel from place to place delivering lectures with the object of reconciling the materialistic principles of the natural sciences with religious need. They believe themselves to be able to furnish an equivalent for the Church. To so great an extent do the people distrust the Church that these men, succeed, at least for a time, in attaining surprising results, even though experts may realize that their actual scientific contributions are quite unimportant.

All these tendencies show that, during the last decade, in spite of the predominating influence of realistic thinking, there has been such a seeking after God, as has not been known for many a year. Theology is doing its best to come to the help of those who are seeking. The more the people have grown out of sympathy with the Church and the more, in spite of this, the interest in religious questions has increased, just so much the more has it come to the consciousness of all the various theological tendencies, even of such as are not interested primarily in apologetics, that they must come to an understanding with the Spirit of the Age. The entire German theology has taken up a defensive or an aggressive attitude over against those forces in the life of the nation which are, more and more, threatening to overwhelm theology and Church together.

Under these circumstances, it is easily explainable that those theological schools which, during the closing decades of the nineteenth century, were in control, have slowly but surely lost ground. It is true that the Wellhausian theory has offered a powerful resistance. Further, many conservative scholars, such as Kittel, Rothstein, etc., like the genuine Wellhausians Cornill, Budde, Meinhold, etc., accept the Wellhausian theory with regard to the sources of the Pentateuch and the origin of the Old Testament sources in general. Wellhausen's characteristic work, however, was a historical hypothesis, with an

evolutionary coloring, to be sure, which cannot be traced back to historical research. The same fate has overtaken this hypothesis which overtakes all historical theories, as soon as the discovery of fresh materials has widened the circle of observation. To-day our knowledge of ancient history, by the archaeological excavations and the ever increasing interpretation of the materials which they bring to light, is much greater than when Wellhausen formulated his theory. Everyone has the feeling that, after what has been discovered, still greater results are to be awaited. What, for instance, may we not expect when the Hethite sources in Boghazkoi have been deciphered? In all this uncertainty, how could any hypothesis hope to remain in control?

To an even greater extent, it is recognized at the present time, that the once victorious Ritschlian theology, in spite of the fact that its fundamental principles are still championed by such prominent theologians as Herrmann and Kaftan, is a standpoint which can no longer be maintained. Ritschl's system was also founded to a great extent upon a definite historical conception of the early Church and of the fundamental ideas of the Reformation. This conception has exerted a powerful influence, so that we must thank Ritschlian school, especially Harnack and Loofs, for the extraordinary development in the study of the history of Dogma. However, our knowledge both of the early Church and of the Reformation has greatly increased, and other conceptions are asserting themselves. Owing to this fact, one of the most valuable fundamentals of Ritschl's dogmatic system has become uncertain. This, however, is not the most important. On the contrary, if my interpretation of the development is correct, the fate of the entire Ritschlian system was decided by the evangelical-social movement which took place in the nineties.

It was, in my judgment, a very great movement. Hofprediger Stoecker (preacher at the royal Cathedral in Berlin), the father of Christian socialism, together with his friends from the "Inner Mission" (what we call "Innere Mission") and

from the conservative theology, entered into an alliance with the young Ritschlians. The latter, at that time at the very height of their influence, were furnished with an organ in Rade's newly founded magazine, *The Christian World* (*die Christliche Welt*). This alliance succeeded, for a time, in quieting theological controversies. Great enthusiasm characterized the evangelical-social conventions. The urgent social needs of the laboring classes were acknowledged, and the power of the Gospel and of the Christian idea of the Kingdom of God to meet these needs was emphasized. Thus it was hoped, not only that the social conditions of the laboring classes would be improved, but also that they would be won back to a knowledge of the actual truth of Christian salvation. It was confidently expected, that the so-called "Revisionism" in the social democratic party would cause them to take up an entirely new position with regard to national-patriotic and religious questions.

These dreams, however, quickly vanished. This fact should certainly be of interest to the similar movements, which, as I hear, are, at the present time, making their appearance in the United States. The, from the beginning, strange alliance between Stoecker and Harnack quickly went to pieces. Further, it soon became apparent that economic developments follow their own laws, and thus, that no definite social programme can possibly be drawn from the Gospel, even although it can furnish the ground principles of ethical living. Above all, social democracy remained what it had been before. "Revisionism" did not exercise any lasting influence and, like State Socialism, the evangelical-social movement caused the laboring classes to cling even more closely to social democracy.

This negative result not only caused several gifted young theologians, such as Naumann, Göhre, etc., to devote themselves entirely to politics in the liberal and, in some cases, even in the social democratic party. It also caused a new direction in theology itself. The Ritschlian school split up into two factions. The right wing, men like Kaftan, Loofs, Häring,

Kattenbusch, etc., drew closer to the conservatives. The left wing, under the leading of Harnack, however, plainly felt the need of broadening the basis of the Ritschlian theology so as to render the Gospel more attractive to the educated and uneducated masses who had grown out of touch with the doctrine of the Church. The conflict now centered itself around the New Testament and the Person of Christ. Ritschl himself had held fast to the Divinity of Christ, even if in a definite and restricted sense. This section of his school, however, by weakening from point to point the Christology of the Church, attempted to accommodate themselves to the temper of the age and the common spirit of science. The first point of attack was the Virgin Birth. Then, the miraculous in general, which could not be explained according to the general laws of human psychology, was declared impossible. Lastly, the Resurrection itself, as an actual, bodily occurrence, was denied. How, however, could such a conception be reconciled with the sources, even with the witness of the synoptic gospels? With regard to the literary problems related to the origin of the Biblical books, the exponents of this view were by no means inclined to go back to the solutions which had been offered by the Tübingen School. On the contrary, Harnack and most of the theologians which we are here considering, by applying the ordinary canons of historical criticism to the books of the New Testament, have reached conclusions friendly to the traditional position. For instance, Harnack, in consideration of the last verses of the book of Acts with its sudden end, has placed it before the persecutions under Nero; he dates the Gospel according to St. Luke still earlier. These theologians save themselves, however, by maintaining that the Jesus of the Synoptics has already received touches from the oral tradition of the first Christians. These touches, they assert, must be removed, before we can get at the real historical Jesus. The attempt has also been made, especially by the late Wrede of Breslau, widely to separate the historical Jesus from his apostle Paul. Wrede maintains that Paul, before his conversion, believed in a Heavenly Being, a

Divine Christ. Then, by uniting this conception with the traditional Jesus, he arrived at his Christology.² Finally, the eschatology which permeates the entire New Testament, and the expectation of the near approach of the Parusia, have been used to show that no one to-day can accept, unmodified, the belief of the early church. What however remains, when all unhistorical additions have been removed?—that the real Jesus was nothing more than a religious hero, who did not overstep the bounds of human capability, and whose abiding importance is to be found in his ethical teaching and in his belief in God, as the Father. In this way he has taught us to understand ourselves, the world and God; and through his love for even the outcasts of humanity, he has shown us what we as Christians ought to do.

Many highly gifted men have worked earnestly and enthusiastically upon this interpretation of Jesus. In addition to those already mentioned, we may name Rade with the staff of the “*Christliche Welt*,” Jülicher, Bousset, von Soden, Wernle, Weinel, etc. The circle has never drawn close enough together to form a definite school. However its representatives name themselves with pride exponents of the Modern Theology. They hoped, by means of their interpretation of Jesus and the Gospel, to reach and convert the Spirit of the Age. Accordingly these modern theologians are inspired with the necessity of popularizing their views—a necessity which was not felt by the earlier theology. From this group have gone forth the “*Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher für die deutsche Christliche Gegenwart*,” an undertaking, by means of which the results obtained by this movement have been spread abroad in tracts, many of them very skilfully written.

The very title of this collection of tracts is significant. It shows that meanwhile the interest and energy of many of these “modern” theologians had entered fields, again far removed from the circumscribed scripturalism of Ritschl. I refer to

² Cf. his study “Paulus,” in *Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbüchern*, p. 86.

what we call in Germany "religionsgeschichtliche Theologie" Even in its early circumscribed character, this movement sufficed to push to one side the questions which Ritschl had proposed. The same fate was to overtake the Wellhausian position. The religionsgeschichtliche Methode was introduced first of all, in Germany, by Old Testament scholars and Assyriologists such as Gunkel, Delitzsch and Zimmern. The movement gave itself out, at first, merely for a method. Instead of the exaggerated importance given to the literary questions, such as whether a prophetic book or only a part of it originated at an earlier or later date, they emphasized the value of the actual contents of the Bible, of the truths set forth and of its religious character. The origin and development of the Biblical truths themselves should be the first objects of research. For this purpose the best method was a comparison with the various religions outside of the Bible.

This new scientific attempt was bound to come. The surprising thing is that it made its appearance in German theology at so late a date. Just as the first gradual acquaintance with the primitive races and the heathen civilized peoples could not but exert a lasting influence upon the rise of English Deism; even so, it was impossible that present-day theology could remain uninfluenced by the overwhelming mass of material, relating to the history of religions, which anthropology, ethnology and philological research have brought to light. But the work in this field did not remain a quiet research into and exposition of the primitive and classical religions, such as, for instance, the late von Orelli offered, in his *History of Religions*. On the contrary, a radical relativism developed out of the method and programme of this "comparative religion group," which, if it had succeeded in gaining control, would have meant a revolution for the entire theology.

First of all came the Babel and Bible conflict. I myself happened to be present at Delitzsch's lecture in Berlin, which, although far from being important by reason of its contents,

attracted the attention of the entire land and gave rise to lively expressions of opinion, favorable and unfavorable, because of the Kaiser's presence and interest. The so-called Panbabylonianism of men like Hugo Winckler, Jeremias and Jensen³ quickly followed. Of these Jeremias is comparatively conservative, Jensen however is extremely radical, yes, even phantastical. According to Panbabylonianism, not only is Babylon the starting-point for the entire European culture up to the present time—but, above all, the Bible is impregnated with Babylonian ideas. The religion of Israel sprang out of the theory that the heavenly sphere is similar to the earthly, and that happenings here are like occurrences there. Thus the religion of the Bible is said to be rooted in astrological mythology, and the biblical stories are explained as astrological-mythological legends, with a more or less certain historical kernel. However, since Panbabylonianism had attacked the New Testament, it was impossible to remain satisfied with Babylonian influences alone. A group of scholars, among whom Gunkel and Bousset may be mentioned, maintained the influence, not only of Babylon, but of Persia, the Near East, Egypt, the Greco-Roman civilization, and above all of the religious syncretism of the age of the Roman kaisers. Along the same line, many non-theological scholars took part in the studies into the history of religions. Besides the Semitic scholars and the Assyriologists, whom I have mentioned above, classical philologists, before all Usener, Reitzenstein and Dietrich, and philosophers like Wundt, of Leipzig, may be named.

Permit me, very briefly, to outline a typical example of the general point of view which results from the history of religions way of looking at things. My example, however, is not drawn from a theologian, but from Wundt's extensive work *Völkerpsychologie*, which in its second part under three subdivisions takes up Myth and Religion. According to Wundt, the religion of primitive peoples is nothing more than the fear of

³ *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, 1906.

demons and spirits. The primitive thinking expresses itself in mythical fairy tales, which travel from place to place. This first stage has not yet developed Gods. The conception of a God first arises, when the adventurous figures of the fairy tales grow into heroes who act and strive, battle and conquer, and when these personal characteristics are transferred to various demons. Thus it is only at a higher cultural stage that Gods appear, by means of the hero legends. Not until then do the magical practices of primitive peoples develop into a genuine religious cult. Finally, in the higher stages of development, the cult-legends, from which the cult draws its symbols and its lasting power in general, attach themselves to the cult. By a cult-legend, Wundt understands the description of the life of a divine or rather divine-human personality, who through his conduct and suffering, gives to men earthly and heavenly benefits, in his office of bringer of salvation and deliverer. Wundt considers the narratives of the New Testament to be such a cult-legend, to be sure, with an historical kernel. This cult-legend is indispensable to the Christian cult, but the real value and content of the Christian religion is not to be looked for in the legend, but in the metaphysical-ethical ideas of the religion.

In this psychological view of the origin and development of religion in general, one greatly misses, to be silent concerning all else, the raising of the question as to truth. In other words, the origin and essence of religion are treated, without any reference to the actual existence of God and the possibility of a revelation. If there is really revelation, the progress from mythical fairy-tale to the cult-legend of the New Testament immediately appears very different. It is accordingly hardly possible, that any German theologian could entirely adopt Wundt's position. Nevertheless tendencies come here clearly to the light of day which are, to a certain extent, implicitly present in the history of religions way of looking at things. Still the history of religions method can show very different characteristics, according to the point of view and the objects

to which it turns its attention. As evidence, I make mention of Ernest Troeltsch, professor of theology in Heidelberg. For him also is it a postulate of the scientific historical method that religion is a continually growing phenomenon. The gospel itself, together with every expression of Christianity in ancient times, in the Middle Ages, at the Reformation and to-day, is for him a phenomenon, conditioned by contemporary history. No one of these can truly claim to be the absolute religion. Troeltsch, however, takes a very different standpoint from Wundt, with regard to the actuality of God's self-revelation, which comes with convincing power in mystical experiences. Accordingly, Troeltsch has, for a long time past, devoted himself to research work in Protestantism (see for instance his exposition of Protestant Christianity in the *Kultur der Gegenwart* [culture of the present day], Part I, Section IV, 1906, and his *Christliche Soziallehren* [Christian social doctrines], 1912). His work, however much his conclusions may be criticized in detail, is from all sides acknowledged as stimulating to lead to further results.

The variety of the undertakings among the history of religions groups is, in itself, witness, that one cannot speak of a "School," except in a very restricted sense. Even their method as a whole has lately reached a crisis. The cause was the publication of Professor of Philosophy Arthur Drews' *Christus-mythe* (Christ-myth), and the same professor's public lectures. Drews is far more extreme than Wundt. While the latter sees the strength of the Christ legends in the historical person, who stands behind all later additions, the former maintains the scarcely believable theory that there was no historical Jesus. Accordingly to him, Christianity, the greatest spiritual force of the world's history, is, in its obscure origin, crystallized out of a syncretism, pregnant with myth. Drews thus attacks the "Jesuanism" of the already mentioned liberal theologians, *i. e.*, their attempts, through historical criticism, to reach the historical Jesus, by removing all later additions. In opposition to this attempt, Drews maintains—unquestion-

ably correctly—that the Jesus whom the Gospels describe is, as a matter of fact, the Divine Savior, the Son of God who became man. If this is denied, the value of the Gospels as historical sources becomes extremely uncertain, and one is quite within his rights, if he doubts that Jesus ever existed. Drews' *Christusmythe* is, however, not only a judgment against the liberal Gospel criticism, it is also a critic of at least the extravagances of the history of religions method. It is true that the method of Drews itself in his theological reasoning is unprofessional, and that he has made very bad mistakes. Therefore Gunkel and others of the history of religions group have tried to shake him off; but their success has been only partial. In the extravagances of a Drews, the weakness of the history of religions method, as practiced in Germany, becomes apparent. Documents and inscriptions which owe their origin to stages of civilization, separated by centuries and often by thousands of years, are placed side by side. Then the most extreme conclusions are drawn from coincidences in particulars, themselves often extremely vague. Such a method no modern historian, with his wealth of sources, can acknowledge as scientific. Since the publication of Drews' book, the feeling, in my judgment, has spread that history of religions research must adopt a more precise method. The work is important and necessary, but greater care must be exercised, if reasonably reliable scientific results are to be obtained.

Now that the Ritschlian and Wellhausian schools, together with their successors, the modern theologians and the history of religions group, have come more and more into discredit, a favorable opportunity has arrived for the conservative or so-called "Positive" Theology. Throughout the nineteenth century this theology has never failed; but it has worked quietly. As a result it has received far too little attention outside of Germany. Naturally, it cannot point to such brilliant scientific results as its rivals. These latter, including all which lies between Ritschl and Drews, are comprehended, with a certain stretching of the meaning of the term, under

“Modern Theologians.” The Positive Theology has also far less influence upon the newspapers and upon the press in general, apart from those publications which it immediately controls. However it has developed an energetic activity, which, in many instances, has led to more important results than those reached by its opponent. The latter itself ever returns to the former, to regain its bearings after the failure of each of its attempts to reconcile religion with the spirit of the times. The positive theology is ever in closer touch with the controlling orthodoxy of the Church as well as with the belief of the pietistic bodies. Its chief work is therefore the maintaining and upbuilding of the Church and, to this object it gives most of its adherents. It is still an unquestionable fact that most of the theological students of Germany receive their instruction from positive theologians. The modern theology, on the other hand, has generally laid stress upon keeping in close touch with science and culture in general. To-day, however, the efforts of the modern theologians to popularize their views have led to an accentuation of the opposition between the two groups. Truly, the liberals are accustomed to maintain that the conservatives differ from themselves only in degree. The conservatives, on the other hand, especially in periodicals and assemblies, declare that the liberals have developed a new religion, and they doubt sometimes if this new religion really is still Christian. In truth, the difference between the two groups is by no means small. Dogmatically this difference is greatest in the question of Christ’s Divinity and especially in the matter of his bodily resurrection.

The positive theology of to-day, joyous and eager of conquest, is itself not a united body. Indeed it can easily be separated into various groups. However the differences which exist, are unimportant in comparison with the common basis. First of all, we name those specialists, who are authorities in their own branches, but have no specific, declared system with regard to theology in general. They take up the problems raised by the liberal theologians and consider them in the light

of the divine revelation and the story of salvation. To this group belong among Old Testament scholars the late von Orelli, the late Oettli, König, Kittel and Sellin. The last named is especially worthy of mention on account of his excavations and his work on the questions raised by the history of religions scholars. A distinguished New Testament scholar, who belongs to this group, is Dr. Feine, of Halle. He has energetically dealt in various writings with the central question of the relations between Jesus and Paul. If to-day it is generally acknowledged that Wrede's extreme treatment of this problem is impossible, Feine has done much to show it. Also, not the least important feature of Feine's new "Biblical Theology," is its fair and careful treatment of the history of religions material, from the positive standpoint. Among the theologians of our group, Church historians are naturally the most numerous, because they can most easily do good work and, at the same time, refrain from taking up outspoken position in the theological controversies of the day. I name only one from these Church historians, the venerable Hauck, in Leipzig, the editor of the third edition of the well-known Real-Encyclopedie. His large history of the Church in Germany during the Middle Ages is considered by many to be the most valuable Church-historical work which we at present, in Germany, possess.

In spite of the high value we place upon these specialists, it remains true that the positive theology would easily be side-tracked, if it were not for the work of other groups who not only have an eye for the individual problems, but also seek to permeate the entire theology with their principles. These undertakings, even when they do not fully reach their goal, owe their fundamental principles and their distinctive nature, according to the general character of the positive theology, to their close connection with definite Church and religious tendencies. In this, they are the continuation of old movements. Thus, since Bengel and Tobias Beck, the so-called "Biblicism" has represented the theology of pietism or, as it is now called, of the "Gemeinschaftsbewegung" (movement

of pietistic communities). The latter has spread rapidly especially during the last decades. The best known representatives of Biblicism are the late Kaehler, of Halle, and Schlatter, of Tübingen. They exert a powerful influence in the student world. Their theology is Biblical. Taking the Bible as a whole, they seek to build up their doctrine in closest possible contact with the biblical ground truths. In doing this, they do not bother themselves very much concerning critical and confessional questions. Thus Kähler did good service in his modern renovation and compensation of the old theory of inspiration. In addition, these present-day Biblicists show important progress, when compared with those of the past. Tobias Beck wished to draw the doctrines of the Christian faith so directly from the Bible, that, for him, dogma and Biblical theology coincided. Kähler and Schlatter, on the other hand, find in the Scriptures that personal life of piety, as planted by God through the eternal ("übergeschichtlichen") Christ. This life must, first of all, be fixed in its original utterances and relations. Then only can the normative principles for our present-day thinking be raised. However, the weakness of the old Biblicism still remains. The system is not comprehensive enough. While the question, how each one finds his personal salvation in Christ, is extensively treated, the problems, growing out of the present situation in Church, society and science, are not sufficiently considered. A suggestion, made by Schlatter, is highly characteristic in this connection. In his opinion, all strife in schools and Churches could be ended, if only all parties would unite upon the Lord's prayer and acknowledge it to be a complete confession of faith! As if confessions of faith were not ever born out of controversy, and as if the Lord's Prayer were not too good for a controversial formula!

In the present state of affairs, as it has been above described, it is not at all surprising that the confessional theology of the Lutheran Church has not died out. This could hardly be the case in view of the rich and powerful interpretation of this

theology, offered in the nineteenth century. Its present representatives are the direct disciples of the great Erlangen scholars Hofmann, Thomasius and Frank. Following in Hofmann's footsteps, the venerable scholar Zahn has created monuments of his own energy, his scholarship and his prudent attention to churchly needs. These are his introduction to the New Testament, his commentaries and his researches in New Testament canon history, in which he, for the most part, combats Harnack's position. Frank's most influential disciple in the dogmatical field is Ihmels, of Leipzig. The most powerful personality of this group, Reinhold Seeberg, is also a product of the Erlangen School. He turned his attention first to the history of dogma. His book, written in opposition to the works of Harnack and Loofs, has attained a position of honor. He has further given new life to the positive theology as a whole. He has done most towards the working out of a "modern positive theology." The programme of this movement is approximately that of the "modern theology" of the younger Ritschlians. The difference is, that the modern positive theologians are convinced that the reconciliation between Christianity and the spirit of the times can be brought about only, as there is no modification of the ancient Christian faith, as witnessed in the creeds of the Church. This line of thought influences nearly every positive theologian of the present, but above all general superintendent Theodor Kaftan, Grütz-macher in Erlangen, Dunkmann in Greifswald and, last not least, Stange, professor of dogmatics in Göttingen, distinguished by great dialectical keenness, have acknowledged this goal of the modern positive theology.

This general programme for a "modern theology of the ancient faith" is not specifically related to the characteristic ground principles of the confessional theology of the Lutheran Church. This is one of the many signs that the difference between the Reformed Churches—and under Reformed Churches I understand all evangelical bodies which had their rise in the Swiss reformation, *i. e.*, in Calvinism—between

the Reformed Churches and Lutheranism is not strongly felt in Germany to-day. Here lies a danger, that what is particularly characteristic in the Reformed Churches may be lost. The neglect of these characteristic features may be traced back to the school of Ritschl. Since then, the controversies concerning the fundamental truths of Christianity have worked in the same direction. That there is little interest in the Reformed theology is shown by the limited knowledge, which the German theology possesses of the history of the evangelical Churches outside of Germany. The last work on a subject from the history of the English and Scotch Churches, which appeared in Germany, was Weingarten's "*Revolutionskirchen*" (Churches of the English revolution), written in eighteen hundred and sixty-eight. American protestantism has never been adequately treated.

Very recently, however, there has been a reawakening of interest in the Reformed Churches. This dates from about the time of the Calvin jubilee and is exemplified in the works of Troeltsch, above all in his "*Christian social doctrines*." This scholar has taken a more comprehensive standpoint in appreciating protestantism as a whole. This same object is pursued by a small but promising group, to which I would like to direct your attention. It can be named the positive Reformed group and most of its members are still comparatively young. They seek to interpret modern problems in the light of the Reformed theology and thus to introduce fresh points of view. Like the modern positive theologians, they have the tendency to repeat old thoughts and obtrude them upon the generation of to-day. In many ways they are related to Biblicism, but they seek to avoid the inadequacy of the Biblical theology. By going back to the ground principles of the Swiss Reformation, and first of all of Calvin, they hope to enrich with them the Biblicism and to develop a complete system of theology. Representatives of this group are Rothstein in the Old Testament, the late Barth and Riggensbach of Basle in the New Testament, Hadorn of Bern, Golters of Bonn, and myself

in Church history, and Karl Müller of Erlangen in dogmatics.

I hope that my treatment, summary as it is, has given you an idea of the most characteristic movements in present-day theological thought in Germany. At least, you will have seen that, while there is no one controlling school, there is a very active interest in theological questions, and that this interest shows itself in a great variety of men and currents of ideas. In this interest and in these movements lies also our hope for the future of our German Church.

I trust, that my brief survey has awakened your sympathy, and that you may have been incited to a closer study of the subject.

HALLE, GERMANY.

II.

CALVINISM IN PRESENT-DAY GERMANY.

A. LANG.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, there was in Germany a large appreciation of Calvin and the Swiss Reformation. Henry, a French-Reformed preacher in Hamburg, afterwards in Berlin, had written his valuable life of Calvin (three volumes, 1833-44). His successor, Ernest Staehelin, of Basle, gave his life of Calvin (two volumes, 1863), in the well-known collection "Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church." In this collection such able men as Hagenbach, Christophel, Baum, Staehelin, Sudhoff, Pressel, Brandes and others, united in describing the prominent Reformers and the blessed beginnings of the Reformed Church. Besides them, there were different prominent Reformed theologians in Germany: Hundeshagen and Ullmann in Heidelberg, Heppe in Marburg, Ebrard in Erlangen, and in Strassburg the well-known scholars Baum, Amitz and last not least Reuss were beginning to publish the great *Opera Calvini* (edition in the Corpus Reformatorum, in fifty-nine splendid volumes).

But the times changed. The interest in the Genevan Reformer became weaker from year to year. The German theologians permitted two catholic or old-catholic historians: Kampschulte, professor of history in Bonn, and his friend Cornelius, professor of history in Munich, to take upon themselves the task to study and describe the life and work of Calvin. Kampschulte died as early as eighteen hundred seventy-two; the first volume of his book, *John Calvin, His Church and His State in Geneva*, was published eighteen hundred sixty-nine, the second, thirty years later (eighteen hun-

dred ninety-nine), the third was not written at all. Cornelius, his colleague, to whom Kampschulte had left his papers, lately published only the book, *Historical Studies from the Time of the Reformation* (eighteen hundred ninety-nine).¹ The two historians, educated in the school of the great Leopold Ranke, wished to be entirely impartial; and Cornelius's book, as a whole, is indeed impartial, because he expressly limits his work to research and reports the naked facts. But Kampschulte, who attempts to delineate the very character of the reformer, is not able to understand the religious movement of the Reformation and the heart of Calvin. He has brought much new knowledge, especially from the records of Geneva. However, having been a Catholic priest in his youth, and later under the influence of the Genevan Galiffe, a man of an outspoken liberalism and rationalism, he has given in his work in many points more a caricature than a picture of Calvin.

Nevertheless Kampschulte, in the seventies, eighties and nineties of the preceding century, was considered by nearly all scholars in Germany as the best writer on Calvin. No theologian labored to correct his statements. This indifference was in a great part the effect of Albrecht Ritschl's theology which by this time came more and more in control of the situation. Ritschl was a strong admirer of Luther, and his system was founded in a definite conception of the Lutheran Reformation. Upon all other reformers, and also upon Zwingli and Calvin, he pronounced his decision, that what was good in their writings and works, they had got from Luther. According to him, Luther is the type of the Reformation, and all others are shadows. In his great work *Justification and Atonement*² he ventured to say: that predestination is but an appendage of Calvin's system, which he added because of his opinion that St. Paul teaches election and reprobation, but not with a deep religious interest of Calvin's own! Ritschl's *History of*

¹ *Historische Arbeiten aus der Reformationszeit.*

² *Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung*, three volumes, 1870-74; fourth edition, I, 1902; II, 1909; III, 1895.

Pietism (three volumes, 1880–1886), was an example of unjust appreciation, both for Pietism itself and for Calvin. Ritschl meant that the peculiarities of Calvin, which distinguish him from Luther, and in which also Pietism has taken its historical roots, have preserved an element of the mystical piety of the Middle Ages. With a similar judgment Calvin was treated by the historians of doctrine, by Harnack and Loofs as well as by Seeberg. There is a well-known sentence of Harnack: Calvinus Lutheranus. The Ritschlians did not need any more. All other thoughts that Calvin had produced were not of value for them; it was too old, and was of the Middle Ages.

This was the situation in the nineties and at the beginning of our present century. In those years, Dr. Adolf Zahn, one of my predecessors at the cathedral and at the Reformed congregation in Halle, was full of complaints, that genuine Calvinism had died out in Germany. He called himself with bitter emphasis the last disciple of the Genevan Reformer. However, slowly a change has occurred. At the anniversary of Zwingli's birth, eighteen hundred eighty-four, at Marburg, the "Reformed Alliance of Germany" was founded by the deputies of several Reformed congregations. It has had under the leadership of Rev. Dr. Brandes, who still lives as a very old man in Bückeburg,^{2a} and of my father-in-law, Pastor Calaminus in Elberfeld, a very considerable development. By the alliance and its friends, young students in the universities were gathered and incited to deeper studies of the Swiss Reformation and especially of Calvin. I was one of these young men. Hitherto it has been the work of my life, to make researches in Calvin and his historical environments, Zwingli, Bucer at Strassburg and the Heidelberg Catechism, and to spread in Germany a more thorough and profound knowledge of their works and ideas. A somewhat earlier theologian, E. F. Karl

^{2a} The death of the Rev. Dr. F. H. Brandes has just been announced in the religious press. He died at Bückeburg, in July, at the age of ninety.
EDITOR.

Müller in Erlangen, had already published in 1896 his *Symbolics*, a scientific comparison of the different Christian Confessions and Churches, and in 1903 his Collection of the Reformed Confessions and Creeds. He is at present doing a good work in translating into German the best Commentaries and the Institutes of Calvin. Our efforts to increase the knowledge and to heighten the opinion about Calvin were greatly helped by weighty influences from abroad. The powerful personality of Abraham Kuyper, in spite of the various hesitations and doubts which many in Germany expressed about him, could not fail to make more and more a deep impression. His other works did not attract much attention in Germany; but the lectures which he delivered at Princeton and published later under the title *Calvinisme*, 1908, were translated and much read. Further, in 1899 E. Doumergue, the leader of the Calvinistic party of his French Church, published the first volume of his standard work, *John Calvin, the Man and the Matters of His Time*³ (the first volume, 1910). Naturally, the apologetic character of his work awakened first, so far as one found it worthy of notice, much criticism and opposition. But, as a matter of fact, this book of Doumergue really gave the things as they were in themselves, and it threw down the challenge for a more accurate study of them.

And then came the year 1909. Not only did the Reformed Alliance hold a meeting of thanksgiving in Barmen, but from all sides the greatness of Calvin was acknowledged beyond all expectation. The emperor of Germany sent his telegram to the Geneva jubilee of Calvin; and in the summer of July and during all the harvest time sermons were delivered; professors of most of the theological faculties in the universities read papers, and a large literature of lectures, biographies and other writings about Calvin was published. I call to mind the names of Hermann Dalton in Berlin, Knodt in Herborn, Lobstein in Strassburg, Wernle in Basle, Holl, professor of Church history, in Berlin, Eck in Giessen, Sieffert in Bonn, von Schubert in

³ Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps.

Heidelberg, Arnold in Breslau, Loofs in Halle, Dorner in Koenigsberg. Many of their lectures were of little importance; but, taken all together, they give an idea of the deep impression which the greatness of the Genevan Reformer has produced. And this impression was not so desultory that it disappeared and vanished as quickly as it came. Valuable publications have followed in the four years since then. The most prominent and influential writings of this literature of 1909 and the following years, if I may be silent of my own productions, were the *Calvin Studies of Elberfeld*,⁴ 1909, published by Bohatec; *Calvin's Doctrine of the State*,⁵ by a young historian, Beyerhaus, 1910; a work of Wernle on Calvin and Basle, and Troeltsch's *Christian Social Doctrines*,⁶ 1912. In 1909, we Reformed in Germany collected a fund for the promotion of Calvin studies in our country.⁷ Last year we distributed the first prizes, namely to Beyerhaus and to Wilhelm Goeters, professor in Bonn, for a work on *The Rise of Pietism in the Reformed Church of the Netherlands*,⁸ 1911.

Now, may I be permitted to say to you a few words on the problems in Calvin's life and thought, which have been treated in the last few years in Germany with earnestness. In 1897, I wrote my tract on the *Conversion of the Reformer*, on the question how he became an evangelical Christian. In order, to understand this, what he was, we must know beforehand how he had grown. Calvin himself does not speak of his first Christian experiences, except in one single place, in his Commentary on the Psalms. Another quotation, from his writing to Cardinal Sadolet, in which he gives the two confessions of a preacher and a true evangelical Christian, reveals a purely literary character. For the two confessions are opposed to two

⁴ Elberfelder Calvin-Studien.

⁵ Studien für die Staatsanschauung Calvins. I may add that everyone who has an interest in my publications can receive them through the Publication House of the Reformed Church in the United States in Cleveland.

⁶ Christliche Sociallehren.

⁷ Calvin-Fonds zur Förderung der Calvin-Studien in Deutschland.

⁸ Die Vorbereitung des Pietismus in der ref. Kirche der Niederlande.

others of the cardinal; therefore they cannot with certainty be used as a description of the way in which Calvin himself came to evangelical views. But the statements in the Commentary on the Psalms, which remain, are very meager. Calvin says here only that "God has by His providence, when I was stubbornly sunk down in the filth of the Popery, given my course another direction, and subjected my mind through a 'rapid conversion' (*subita conversio*) into docility to his word." What did he mean by this rapid conversion? Was Calvin a successor of St. Paul and a predecessor of the methodist John Wesley or the pietist Augustus Hermann Francke? Could he date the hour in which the hand of the Almighty God grasped his heart? Or was his own report inexact, a religious description of an occurrence, whose human factors, whose gradual development are passed by, in silence? In spite of his own narrative, was his great experience a slow evolution, which began already in Noyon, was more and more promoted by his environments and the various influences which he received from his kinsman Olivetan, from his teacher Melchior Wolmar, from his friends in the universities and many others? The importance of this question for all religious psychology is easy to be seen. The latter opinion of a slow evolution is proposed by Doumergue, and in Germany with a large mass of learned notices and researches by Karl Müller, professor of Church history in Tübingen, in his treatise, 1905, published by the Göttingen society of sciences. However, in spite of all his erudition, it happened to him that he translated a passage in a Latin writing of Calvin wholly falsely.⁹ After I had pointed out this mistake in my "John Calvin," published 1909, the confidence of nearly all German

⁹ The words in Calvin's dedication of the Commentary on the Second Epistle to Corinthians to Wolmar: *nisi me ab ipsis prope carceribus mors patris revocasset*, were translated by Müller: "If the death of my father had not delivered me from the prison of the study of the laws." Actually Calvin might say: "If the death of my father had not called me away from the very beginning of my study of the Greek language under Wolmar." See my *John Calvin*, 1909, p. 203 sq.

scholars in his opinion vanished away.¹⁰ To-day, the statement can be looked upon as settled, that before the great occurrence in the year 1533 we cannot prove by means of historical research a previous slow development and religious influences, to which Calvin owed his Christianity. It is certain: his words about his rapid conversion are to be taken literally. We must discern two sections in the life of Calvin: the first part, his childhood and his youth, is overshadowed by the darkness of our ignorance. However, if for a moment the shadows clear up and a flash of historical light falls upon the boy and student, we see in Calvin a youth eager and hungry after knowledge and learning, diligent above his powers, prudent and full of conscientiousness in all his relations, but not a decided character in his religious feeling. In the second and greater part of his life, after his conversion, Calvin stands in the full light of history: he has become a man, as the Council of Geneva said at the time of his death, a "character of great majesty," whose majesty was the totality of his obedience to God. That was the effect of the power of God which touched him in fifteen hundred thirty-three.

After his conversion, Calvin was a complete man. In his religious consciousness and also in his theology, he did not know any wavering changes or a development in the true sense of this word. From the first edition of his *Institutes* which he wrote as a young man of twenty-six years, nearly every sentence is to be found again in the last and greatly enlarged edition. The constancy of his principles was the peculiar greatness of Calvin's personality. At the same time, it was a fortunate occurrence, that Calvin, when he assented to the Gospel, found evangelical teachers who immediately helped on the newly won convert. There is no doubt that Luther, the father of the whole Reformation, was one of his teachers. He learned from the Wittenberg Reformer the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, justification by divine grace and our

¹⁰ Naturally not only because of this small fault, but because of many other arguments.

faith. Calvin looked upon himself during his whole life as a grateful disciple of Luther. However, where is the origin of his distinctive doctrines, who is his teacher in all that separates him from Luther? This is the second problem of our studies of Calvin in Germany. Is it nothing else but remnants from the mystical, catholic piety of the Middle Ages? Or is there an element of humanism or rationalism? Here the question of such weighty doctrines as Calvin's symbolism of the sacraments, his conception of the Church and of the order of the Church, finally his proper doctrine of predestination, appears. Are all these doctrines of minor importance, without value for genuine evangelical piety? In regard to these doctrines, it seems to me, a discovery which I made in the course of my researches was not of small importance. I found that for Calvin a teacher of equal influence with Luther, even his spiritual father, was the Strassburg Reformer Martin Bucer. From him he received the ground principles of his doctrine of the sacraments, of the Church and of predestination. Bucer represents the middle link between Zwingli and Calvin. He completes by his peculiarities the type of piety which is the power of the Reformed Church. Bucer remained a long time unknown and unesteemed. The Strassburg Church, after his death in England under Edward the Sixth, became Lutheran; his best-known work in Germany, the Wittenberg concord, which he produced in the sacramentarian conflict with the Wittenberg Reformers in 1536, was too concessive, and not of a durable effect. Therefore he was forgotten; the historians considered him as a man of second importance. But now, by the more exact researches of our days, he is brought into prominence. He is acknowledged as a fine politician, and also, in spite of any contradictions, his appreciation as a religious character, as the teacher of Calvin in the most important things, found assent from nearly all sides. And now Strassburg has undertaken to erect his monument in the year nineteen hundred seventeen.

The relations of Calvin to Bucer, being of such striking im-

portance, enlighten a further old problem, the right understanding of Calvin's predestination. Because of this doctrine, how many reproaches have been until to-day heaped on the reformer. His idea of God is compared with the stiff and stubborn God of Mohammed. Calvin's God must be a tyrant and a monster, whose will stands for reason and right. However, on this point a splendid change has appeared. Even without fully appreciating Bucer's influence, numerous publications in the last years, peculiarly in 1909, have justified Calvin's idea of God. I call to mind a tract of Max Scheibe, written already in eighteen hundred ninety-seven, *Calvin's Doctrine of Predestination*,¹¹ and in the Elberfeld-Calvin studies a treatise of Bohatec: Calvin's doctrine of providence.¹² It is there clearly proved that, if God deals according to His fully independent and sovereign will, if He elects and reprobates, only as it pleases His Majesty, there is no arbitrariness or unworthy caprice. It is within His full right to propose His own purposes, as He thinks fit; His will is in every case holy and without reproach. Nevertheless, this true and delightful statement did not wholly discharge the question. The same authors who declared that arbitrariness was not a part of Calvin's idea of God, showed a new inclination to another old mistake, namely, to accentuate too strongly the predestination in Calvin's system. Is Calvin's piety nothing but dependence on God, obedience to His will and the experience of His election and the carrying out of His eternal decrees? Is the task of Christ, the work of His spirit and His Church, only the accomplishment of the covenant of the decrees? Formerly Alexander Schweitzer, in his standard work, had called predestination the "central dogma" of the Genevan Reformer. But then came many others. I may in this moment name only Lüttge, *Calvin's Doctrine of Justification*,¹³ 1909. There is in my opinion no doubt, that Calvin's system has not one, but two

¹¹ *Calvin's Prädestinationslehre.*

¹² Cf. *Vorsehungslehre.*

¹³ *Die Rechtfertigungslehre Calvins.*

centers, like an ellipsis in mathematics. First stands the sovereign God, who from all eternity chose and rejected, for the working out of whose plans everything, in Church and state and world—yes even sin and death—must serve. Second stands sinful humanity and Christ, who through His work on earth justifies and saves. The relation of these two centers to each other and their, it must be confessed, not always perfect organic combination—these give rise to the wealth of Calvin's theology. Here is its real worth also for our own age.

As a matter of fact, in these two centers in his religious feeling and thinking Calvin follows Bucer in the ripest development of the Strassburg Reformer. Moreover, Bucer shows an interesting and striking form of the doctrine of predestination which also explains many features in Calvinism in the right sense. If now we speak of election and the eternal decrees, we look upon them as the acts of God. On the contrary, Bucer in the writings of his first period, seldom discusses the decree of the predestination. His interest lies on the men themselves as the chosen ones. The questions which attract his attention are such as: how the elect come to faith. How they receive the certainty of their salvation. Can they fall from the state of grace before God? What are the signs of a true believer and godly man? These more ethical and psychological questions were discussed by Bucer with a strong inclination to throw the metaphysical questions, the eternal decrees, in the background. According to Bucer, the reprobate man stands in strong opposition to the elect. From the first beginning and forever, the elect and the reprobate represent the two classes in which the whole of mankind is divided. Everyone, without any exception, belongs to the one or to the other class. A middle position is not possible; and that is for Bucer not a mere theoretical supposition, but an actual fact and a practical principle. Therefore the most important question for the whole life of a Christian is this: Do you belong to the elect of God? And this question has the same sense as the question of the pietists and the methodists: are you a converted

man? Such a conception of predestination includes an outspoken individualism. This individualistic principle Calvin also retained in his doctrine. And in this feature of Calvin is to be found the cause why the Brownists and Congregationalists already at the close of the sixteenth century arose from the Church of Calvin and also the Pietists, Baptists and Methodists in later times. These religious parties have emphasized the one side of Calvinism, namely justification and salvation, we must perhaps say, in more Biblical and psychological terms than Calvin himself. But they have either in no way or in a very weak manner, emphasized the other side; the eternal decrees before the foundation of the world and the kingdom of God which he governs through his elect ones and which comprehends the state and the social life as well as the Church. The task of a modern dogmatics would be the reunion of the two sides according to modern methods of thought. I do not doubt that such a new development of Calvinism would give the Reformed Churches great uplift and progress.

A last problem which is to be mentioned concerns the influence of Calvin and Calvinism on the modern government of states, their liberal and democratic constitution, and on the economic and social conditions of our time. I cannot any further fully speak on this interesting subject, not only because the time fails, but also because of the perplexity of the present scientific situation. There have been proposed very numerous utterances of German scholars, theologians such as Troeltsch and myself, historians as Rachfahl and Beyerhaus, economists as Weber and Sombart. Even the passions were inflamed, everything is in conflict. Rachfahl is against Weber and Troeltsch, Sombart is against each one of these three, Troeltsch and Beyerhaus are against myself. And now, decided results have not been produced. Weber and Troeltsch maintain that the frugality of the industrious Calvinists, their "inner-worldly asceticism," as they call it, is the origin of the "capitalism," which means the modern ideas and standards of popular economy. No, says Sombart, the authors of capitalism

are the Jews. Rachfahl protests: not a class of men and their ethics, but a great number of historical circumstances have originated our modern habits of economy. The controversy between Troeltsch and Beyerhaus and myself concerns the value of natural law to Calvin. In my opinion Calvin is a Biblicist also in his doctrines on state and economy; God's law is the ruling principle of political constitutions and social conditions. According to Troeltsch and Beyerhaus, the natural law, this doctrine of Locke, Rousseau and the rationalists, from which all modern constitutions sprang forth, is not strange to Calvin even as to Melanchthon. I have, however, defended my sentence in a new research of Calvin's meaning in the publications of the Göttingen society of science, 1912, and Troeltsch did not improve his position by the rudeness of his attacks which he turned against me in the work "social doctrines" by means of Beyerhaus's arguments at the same time, as I had already confuted what the latter had brought forth.

I must close my brief remarks. I hope that they have made an impression upon you of the vivid interest in Calvin's life and work and his ideas in Germany at present. This interest is very remote from a blind admiration. But these subjects are as yet in the process of research and discussion, and more and more, as I confidently hope, the persuasion will be produced, that from Calvin our age in religion, theology and social life has much to learn. In this sense, I think, the Calvin studies in Germany are also of importance for America.

HALLE, GERMANY.

III.

DISCOURSE ON THE THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEIDEL- BERG CATECHISM AT LANCASTER, MAY 13, 1914.

A. LANG.

It affords me great pleasure to be permitted to take part in this celebration of our beloved Heidelberg Catechism. Fifty years ago the "Reformed Church in the United States" celebrated the tercentenary of the Catechism under the leadership of Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff. At that time German theologians, the names of whom are well known until to-day, such as Herzog, Ebrard, Ullmann and Hundeshagen, sent you papers which promoted the historical knowledge and theological appreciation of our Catechism. To-day I myself come, kindly invited by you, and bring you many greetings and congratulations for this jubilee and your Church.

Under our German Kaiser the leader of the evangelical State Church in Prussia is the "Evangelical Church Upper Council" (Evang. Oberkirchenrat) at Berlin. Beside this largest Church we also have in several of the Prussian provinces five other State Churches, and moreover each district as Saxony, Baden, etc., has its own Church. These are joined together in the "German Evangelical Church Board" (Deutsch Evangelischer Kirchen-Ausschuss). The president of the Berlin Church Upper Council and of the Church Board is the same person, Dr. Voigts. His excellency Dr. Voigts on March 24 charged me to bring to the "Reformed Church in the United States" on the occasion of the Catechism jubilee the best regards and well wishes of the German Evangelical Church Board as well as of the Evangelical Upper Church Council.

I am very glad to perform this commission of his, and to greet you in the name of the supreme court of all the Evangelical Churches in the whole of Germany. Dr. Voigts has also invited me to make a report and send it to Berlin after my return on the many impressions which I have received in your midst, and especially concerning the German-speaking part of your Church.

The courts of the Reformed Churches themselves in Germany, although belonging to the union of all German Churches in the "Church Board," have ordered me to bring you special greetings. On April 6th the royal Consistory of Aurich (President Dr. Iderhoff) has written to me, to express to you the brotherly sentiments of the "Evangelical Reformed Church in the province of Hannover." The brethren wish you God's blessing upon your present General Synod and a successful development of your church, for the best welfare of everyone of your members and for the glory of God. General Superintendent Dr. Müller has added his personal congratulations and good wishes. Further I have to bring you the hearty greetings from the Reformed Church in Lippe. The Consistory in Detmold and the General Superintendent Wessel have given me this charge, because they know that former inhabitants of Lippe are among your members and have founded your Mission House. And these friends did this with the remarks that for the Church of Lippe the Heidelberg Catechism remains its dearest confession and its manual for the instruction of the youth, approved by centuries of use.

After these Churches comes the Reformed Alliance of Germany, not a synod, but a free union of congregations and individual members. It sends to you the warmest and heartiest greetings. Its Moderator, Pastor Calaminus, of Elberfeld, of the largest Reformed congregation in Germany, numbering about fifty thousand adherents, writes: "May Almighty God, who is sitting above the waters on the throne, lead His Church with His power and grace." According to Pastor Calaminus, the distance between you and him is not great enough to hinder

the communion of brotherhood between us. Also, that the centuries have not been long enough to weaken our Reformed faith. Assenting to God's word and the testimony of the Heidelberg Catechism, we remain here and there, in America and Germany, friends and brethren in Christ. I know with certainty that in Germany many agree with these views whose names I have not time to mention. Last and not least I mention my own congregation, the Reformed Cathedral Church at Halle, and our "Konvikt," a theological seminary of Reformed students, in Halle. They are the next that have asked me in particular to bring their sincere and hearty congratulations and wishes to you.

You see from all this, that your arrangement for a new anniversary of the Catechism has excited the greatest sympathy in Germany. And now, do we not have cause for all this celebration? I am not thinking at this moment of the excellent qualities of the Heidelberg Catechism, about which you have heard and will hear many excellent words; but I think of the great mass of true labor which has been dedicated to this small book during the centuries. It has been translated into a large number of languages, and numerous editions have been prepared by the different generations for the use of the youth. Then, it has also appeared in lessons and sermons, the number of which and their power and warmth is immeasurable. Its questions have been interpreted and impressed on the minds of the people. Out of the abundance of all this work in the past, only poor remnants have been preserved. Nevertheless the abundance of this old literature of Catechism expositions, sermons and other writings on the Catechism, which we yet possess as a sign of the great zeal of past ages and love for our little book, is very striking. A Lutheran professor in Jena, Koecher, who made his researches in the middle of the eighteenth century, enumerated more than a thousand different works on our Catechism which he had known at his time.

This old literature, if we read it with the right interest, gives

us often a vivid picture of the love and care with which our forefathers clung to our Catechism. Ursinus, one of its authors, had by nature a very sad and melancholy mind. The College of Wisdom (Sapientie kolleg), in which he taught to eighty students his Bible, his catechism and his dogmatics, and took care of their bodies as well as of their souls, he usually called his "treadmill." But from this treadmill came forth the well-known interpretations of the Catechism which, translated in the Dutch language by Festus Hommius, became the manual and rule in the Netherlands for the preaching and teaching of the generations in the great war of independence against Spain. In the Reformed Church of the Netherlands the Catechism found its second home. The greatest theologians took an active part in the catechetical instruction of the youth. We have copies of the lessons which Voetius, the leader of the orthodox and Puritan party after the synod of Dort, gave to the boys and girls. At the present time, the well-known Abraham Kuyper esteemed these lessons worthy of being republished. At the time that Voetius lived, his mere liberal adversary Cocceius, the Biblicist, later the theologian of the pietists, also wrote his exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism, however, in a very different method from Voetius. His disciple in Germany was Frederick Adolph Lampe, preacher and professor in Bremen, a very earnest and godly man. His peculiarity was to discern different psychological stages and degrees in man's salvation, conversion and sanctification. He arranged in his sermons distinct passages for each class of his hearers, and it was the custom that the advanced stood up from their seats, when the sermon turned to themselves. For these psychological degrees in the religious position of the people Lampe arranged also the questions of the Catechism. In spite of this singularity, his book entitled *The Milk of Truth*, was very much read and imitated; and even to-day we find in this book, *Milk of Truth*, many good remarks and ideas for teaching the Catechism.

These few examples show that the Heidelberg Catechism was able to nourish centuries and to attract different theologies,

different religious peculiarities. It survived even the age of the Deists and the Rationalists, and although being abolished for a time in most countries, it was restored about the middle of the nineteenth century into many of our congregations. Even in the last fifty years the Catechism has had a history—a history in one relation more fruitful than that of the preceding centuries. Think of the results which the scientific researches have brought forth! Call to mind the names of Nevin and Schaff, of Sudhoff and Wolters, of Kluckhohn and Doedes and Gooszen! The interest of these men lay chiefly in the field of historical research. It is owing to their manifold efforts that we to-day know better than ever, with the exception of the first generation containing its authors, the history of the origin of our Catechism and its original meaning. And lately, books have been published which give a religious and dogmatical explanation of the Catechism and its adaptability to the needs and ideas of our age. Kuyper's *Evoto Dordraceno*, which in four large volumes discuss fully every question, is a standard work and a mine for Reformed preachers and teachers. After the commentary by Ursinus himself, the rich literature on the Catechism is not rich in books at all comparable with such a work as Kuyper's *Evoto Dordraceno*.

All the old and new books I have named are splendid signs of the vitality of our Catechism. But you ask: can we say anything about the fruits which are produced by all these labors in catechetical instruction during the centuries? That is a hard question; nevertheless exciting and challenging an answer. The instruction in the Catechism is only a part of the whole system of the churchly education of people. To know the effect of this whole system is a very difficult task; it seems to be impossible to indicate the part which is produced by the Catechism. Thus, for instance, there is no doubt that the character of the Hollanders would have been something else, if they had not been going through the school of our Catechism. One might perhaps note certain features of their character and find their origin in the Catechism. But such an effort would

have doubtful results. But this fact is certainly worthy of notice. The great period of Dutch history, when in that republic, delivered from Spain, commerce, wealth, art, science and political power took such a tremendous rise, was also the age in which the most prominent men of the nation dedicated the most zealous care to the Catechism. Other important facts can be added. And I might also state this significant contrast, viz., in the Palatinate and in the Prussian Provinces of the Rhine, the evangelical faith could not be extirpated even by the heaviest persecutions, while, on the other hand, under the same conditions, the Lutherans in Austria and old Bavaria soon entirely disappeared. The devotion of the Reformed Church "under the cross" to its faith was owing to many causes. But their faith depended particularly upon their Catechism so greatly cared for by them. At the present time we can mention at least a negative example of the lasting influence of the Heidelberg Catechism. We have to-day in many places of Germany, and especially in old seats of the Reformed Church, such as Bremen, the Rhine region and Westphalia, Baden and so forth, the greatest struggles between a pietistic orthodoxy and an exceeding outspoken rationalism. On the other hand, the Lutheran countries did not have so many strifes. This fact may have several causes. One cause I see in the different use of the Lutheran and Heidelberg Catechism. The former is used by the Lutherans up to the present time, as a whole, equally in school and Church, the latter was in many times replaced by union catechisms, or its instruction softened by subjectivism. The result of this was a decomposition, a dissolving of sound Biblical doctrine and implacable party strife, which has torn up the life of the Church.

After all these results in the past, we are glad that this blessed booklet is until now our own. But what shall be its future? Fifty years ago, the times were very favorable for a Catechism jubilee. At that time, a religious revival in all the evangelical Churches had broken the power of the older Rationalism. The latter had been replaced by a new theology,

based upon the confessions of the Reformation and upon their understanding of the Scriptures. Under these circumstances it was easy to have a celebration of the Catechism, the pearl of our Reformed Church. To-day conditions are very different. In many places, the orthodox theology of the nineteenth century finds itself hard pressed and must stand upon the defensive. Can our Catechism hold its own among the movements of our age, among the new points of view which have come into being?

We are not inclined to put the doubts lightly aside. In every case we Reformed cannot wholly renounce our Catechism unless we renounce ourselves. For this little book of instruction for children has come to be the nearly unique confession of faith for the Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe and in the United States of America. For the German Reformed it is central, because upon it hangs the fate of the Reformed principle as a whole. Our Reformed Church in Germany has never had any great reformer, except Bucer. It has produced no warriors and statesmen like Coligny and William of Orange, the deliverer of the Netherlands; no original, religious character, like Cromwell. It has exerted no such wide political and economical influence as the Huguenots, the Dutch men, and above all, the Pilgrim fathers. Its one great production is the Heidelberg Catechism, and upon this little book, as has been said, depends its very existence. So also, should not our confession of faith be just as important for the Reformed Church in the United States?

If we will retain the Heidelberg Catechism as a confession of our Church, we must attempt, as in former times, to impress it upon the hearts of our people. A confession of faith, only for theologians, not known, used, loved by the youth and elders in the congregation, is not an actual confession, and must soon wholly disappear. Therefore, in Germany, we use every effort to retain our Catechism as a school-book and as a house-book. We modernize the old language of the Catechism, we abbreviate it, leaving out many less important questions, we give

additions on the Bible, missions, Church history and so forth. At this time, I cannot show either all the difficulties of our task, or the means for surmounting the difficulties. But I deny that it is impossible to retain our present generation in real familiarity with the old book. In my opinion, that is impossible only, if the Gospel of the Reformation of the Gospel of St. Paul is no longer suitable for our age. For this purpose only love and labor, much love and labor, in house, school and Church are needed to-day as in the older time.

I hope that this love and labor for the Catechism will be noticeably increased through this anniversary, in Germany, the Netherlands and here in America. In this confidence, I wish that God may richly bless the Reformed Church of the United States and its Catechism, that both may flourish and prosper, that the Reformed Church and the Heidelberg Catechism may see in this country many future hundred-year anniversaries!

HALLE, GERMANY.

IV.

THE RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

A. LANG.

The question which occupies us to-day is not of merely historical value, but our present condition depends largely upon the right answer to it. This little book of instruction for children has come to be the confession of faith for the Reformed Churches on the Continent of Europe and in the United States of America. For the German Reformed it is central, because upon it hangs the fate of the Reformed principles as a whole.

Such considerations justify us in turning our attention for a moment to the question as to what the Catechism meant to its authors and the age in which it originated.

I.

For a scientific judgment concerning the original spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, a great mass of historical material ought to be taken into consideration. We ought to place ourselves, in imagination, in the stirring days of the sixteenth century. We ought to make the pious patron of the Catechism, the Elector Frederick together with its authors, Ursinus and Olevianus, and the entire group who worked upon it, live again before our eyes. The entire historical situation, in which it took its rise, should be present to our minds. More, we ought to have a distinct conception of the course of the Reformation from Luther to Calvin, to Bullinger and to Baron Lasky. But have no fear. I have no intention of burdening you with a mass of information, much of which you already know. I shall but seek to call to mind the most important events.

First of all, I desire to make a remark as to method. The only way to gain an understanding of the meaning which its authors wished to express in our Catechism, is to study it in the light of the earlier catechetical literature. This method of research has been followed first of all by Gooszen and then by myself.

About the year fifteen hundred and sixty three, the Swiss Reformation was still outwardly weak. But it had many a hero of the faith and numerous groups full of earnest piety and evangelical teaching. These groups differed in details and each had its peculiar catechisms. (1) There were the Strassburg books of instruction, before all those of Martin Bucer, simple and devotional. (2) There were the Zurich Catechisms from Leo Jud, warm and having the true evangelical spirit, Zwinglian and yet not exclusively dependent upon Zwingli. (3) Then there were masterpieces from Calvin's pen, crystal-clear in its thought and forming a first attempt at a comprehensive statement of the entire system. (4) There followed the four Laskian Catechisms which marked a step in advance formally. They contained real catechism questions, full of life and power, and were characterized by the attention which they gave to the needs of the congregational life. (5) Lastly there was Bullinger's book of instruction for the advanced pupils of the Latin schools, lacking inner unity, and marked by its decisive stand against Rome.

All these far too little known books, along with the later great productions of England and Scotland, ought to be gathered together in a "*Corpus Catecheticum Ecclesiæ Reformatæ*," a Collection of Catechisms of the Reformed Church. They show us with what energy our fathers worked upon the task of education. Even the greatest among them, just as in the case of Luther, did not think it beneath their dignity to offer their best. Further, the Catechisms which they created, each of them good in its way but none of them ideal, are calculated to teach an important lesson to the present age. They show how difficult it is to write a handbook, able to take

root in a Christian nation and qualified, not only to meet the needs of the present, but to nourish the faith through the centuries. In present-day Germany, subjectivism has gone so far that many pastors, to a certain extent, it is true, forced thereto by the unsystematic character of Luther's catechism, are in the habit of remaking their catechisms to suit themselves. They set about their task without considering that such composition is not everybody's work, that not even every age and generation is called to such a task.

The young authors of the Heidelberg Catechism gathered their material, with care and energy, from the older catechisms. The thorough-going character of their work is shown in the differences between Ursinus's two earlier catechisms and between these and the final recension from the hand of Olevianus. Therefore it seems to me that it is settled, that the relation between the Heidelberg Catechism and its sources must be our guide in interpreting its religious character. Over and over again attention is called to this or that feature which bears a certain resemblance to, for instance, Luther's or Melanchthon's thought. From these, far-reaching conclusions are then drawn. As a matter of fact, such resemblances ought to come under consideration only when the features referred to do not appear in the older catechisms. If these features actually do occur in the sources, they must be interpreted in the light of these sources, and not in that of Luther's or Melanchthon's own thought.

If this method be followed, there is, in my opinion, no doubt that Calvinism is the spiritual and religious soil in which our Catechism has taken root. A weighty and striking proof of this is to be found in Ursinus's first draft, the *Summa Theologiæ* (Ursinus's Larger Catechism). This little book, with its three hundred and twenty-three questions had as its principal source the Genevan Catechism. The articles upon justification, the Church, the Sacraments and Church discipline, all breathe the spirit of Calvin. Sometimes Ursinus goes back from the Genevan Catechism to Calvin's Institutes themselves.

Thus he follows the Institutes in teaching the double predestination and placing it in the same position, while the Genevan Catechism mentions it only by the way. Even the peculiar introduction and the general plan of Ursinus' Larger Catechism, which at first sight seem to differ from Calvin, are found, on closer study, to be based upon his thoughts and principles.

This close relation to Calvin remained unaltered in Ursinus' second catechism (*catechesis minor*) and in the final German recension which produced the Heidelberg. Nowhere is there a really fundamental theological departure from the Larger Catechism and its Calvinism. Now we can see how incorrect it is to talk of the Melancthonian character of the Heidelberg Catechism and thus to attempt to distinguish it from Calvin's religious and theological system. Naturally enough, Ursinus who had been a pupil of Melancthon, adopted certain of his master's definitions and formulæ. But the Calvinistic ground-character was not thereby modified in the Larger Catechism, and in the Heidelberg Catechism even these formulæ have disappeared. Equally false is it when Gooszen names Bullinger, Zwingli's successor, as the source of the Heidelberg Catechism.

II.

That the character of the Catechism is unquestionably Calvinistic can be abundantly proved even from the book itself, without reference to the earlier drafts and the older Catechisms. Take, for instance, the statement of the certainty of salvation. What child-like trust in a loving father and a divine providence speaks in the warm personal "I" and "we," which we find in so many questions! "*My* only comfort in life and death, *I* am not my own, but belong to my Savior; not only to others, but to *me* also, forgiveness of sins is given; what benefit do *we* receive from the resurrection of Christ, *we* are now raised up to a new life, etc." But this is not all. There speaks also in the *answers* the absolute assurance of men who are conscious that, through faith, they have become "members of Christ" (Ques-

tion 32), who feel themselves "righteous before God" (Q. 60), and know that the Lord "shall take me, with all His chosen ones, to Himself, into heavenly joy and glory" (Q. 52, 58). They are assured that "the Holy Spirit will abide with me forever" (Q. 53); "I am, and forever shall remain, a living member of the chosen communion of the Son of God" (Q. 54). This is the certainty of the elect, even if the doctrine of election is not itself formulated. What a contrast this forms to the Lutheran type of religious thinking! Luther was ever convinced of the possibility that the state of salvation could be lost; and that gives a different tone to his catechisms. In his great catechism we read on the sixth petition: "Although we have been forgiven and have become pure from every trace of sin, yet our condition is such, that, whereas to-day we stand, to-morrow we may fall."

Alongside of the sections on assurance of salvation ought to be mentioned the masterly exposition of justification and sanctification. These fundamental evangelical doctrines, weighty both for theory and practice, are also rooted in Calvinism. Calvin worked out the connection between the forgiveness of sins and the new birth to a religious and moral life by means of the conception of our "being grafted in Christ." In this he is closely followed by the Heidelberg Catechism. It says, for example, that by true faith we are ingrafted or incorporated into Christ (Q. 20). Our one comfort in life and death is that we belong to Christ (Q. 1). We are called Christians, "because by faith I am a member of Christ" (Q. 32). The benefit which we receive in baptism is "to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ" (Q. 70); similarly in the Lord's Supper, "by the Holy Ghost we are ingrafted into Christ" (Q. 80, cf. Q. 76). Ingrafting in Christ carries with it freeing from guilt and punishment and also salvation from the state of subjection to sin. The former, because "the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ is granted to me." The latter, because "it is impossible that those who are implanted into Christ by true faith, should

not bring forth fruits of thankfulness" (Q. 64, cf. 86). Upon this foundation, the third part of the Catechism can, without in any way infringing upon evangelical freedom, insist upon practical Christianity, upon a holy manner of life in earnest obedience and prayer as a moral duty demanded by God.

There is nothing in the Heidelberg Catechism greater than its doctrine of salvation. With all the stress which it lays upon the necessity of conversion, it avoids quietism and moral laxness, as well as dead legalism, or methodistical anxiety. The authors of the Catechism learned this doctrine of salvation in Calvin's school. This conception Luther, although the creator of the Reformation, had not clearly expressed, at least not in all passages; Melancthon had lost it more and more, as time went by. Calvin alone, and with him the Heidelberg Catechism, truly preserved the Reformation conception of salvation.¹ Both of them, without denying growth in Christian living, insist upon the fulness and completeness of the character of the believer. This gives him his joy and a consciousness of power, which can overcome the world. The Christian, comforted and free in God, by reason of his Savior's work of reconciliation, separated from the ungodly world, independent of Church and priesthood, with soul and body dedicated to the service of his Master and his brother—this is the type of Christian character peculiar to Reformed Protestantism. This character is theologically most clearly described by Calvin; the best religious interpretation is to be found in the Heidelberg Catechism.

From this great central truth onward, the spirit of Calvin permeates the entire doctrinal structure of the Catechism. Take, for instance, the sections on the Church. According to Question 54 it is a saving institution, which her "Head and King, the Son of God, by his Spirit and word, gathers, defends and preserves" (cf. Q. 31, 46–52). But it is also "a chosen communion," which from the beginning of the world was

¹ For a fuller treatment see my two lectures: "Zwei Calvin Vorträge," Gütersloh, 1911, p. 19 ff.

intended to include the entire human creation, and in which "believers, all and every one, as members of Christ, have part in Him and in all His treasures and gifts" (Q. 55). Thus the conceptions of the Church as an institution and as a brotherhood are harmoniously united. It is at once a creation of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and a social union of the faithful. The community is characterized as a society, in which "each one must feel himself bound to use his gifts, readily and cheerfully, for the advantage and welfare of other members" (Q. 55). Further the Church is a community for the correction and the care of souls, whose final office is the exclusion of those whom its warnings have failed to move (Q. 83-85). These brief utterances do not form a systematic exposition of Presbyterianism, but they express the ground principles of Calvin's conception of the Church eternal, and these ground principles are capable of adaptation to the peculiar needs of communities living under the most varied forms of Church government.

Our judgment of the Catechism's doctrine of the Sacraments cannot be so favorable. Here the authors were afraid of offending Lutherans in the German Empire. Zwingli's valuable conception, that the Sacraments are symbols of confession, by means of which the community declares its faith before God and men—this conception which appears in Ursinus' two previous Catechisms is left out of our Catechism. That which is praiseworthy in its doctrine of the Sacraments—its clear exposition of the divine gift of grace in the symbols—this is again due to the influence of the Genevan reformer.

III.

In its characteristic features, the Heidelberg Catechism is not Lutheran, nor Melanchthonian, nor Zwinglian, nor Bullingerian, nor Bucerian, but Calvinistic. But it is not merely Calvinistic. There is a certain flavor which is all its own. All scholars who are capable of expressing a judgment are agreed upon this point, that Calvinism and the Heidelberg

Catechism do not exactly coincide, in spite of every affinity. Where however are the fine lines of demarcation to be sought? A number of answers have been given. However our more exact knowledge of the historical development of the Catechism and its sources enables us to perceive that such of these answers as are not wholly false must be modified. Take for instance Ebrard's and Gooszen's theory that whereas Calvin was interested intellectually and speculatively, the Heidelberg Catechism represents an anthropological-soteriological or biblical-soteriological conception. This view is at once recognized as false and unjust to Calvin by anyone who has studied the Genevan reformer, even to a limited extent.

The view just considered has been modified by Professor Karl Müller of Erlangen. He declares that, whereas Calvin's system is theocentric, the Heidelberg Catechism is anthropocentric or Christocentric.² Just what is meant by "theocentric" can be understood by considering the chief rival of our Catechism in the Reformed world, the Shorter Westminster Catechism, justly famous for its clearness and brevity. This latter is, beyond doubt, theocentric through and through. As a whole it represents the following simple scheme: God's gracious will, expressed in the "Eternal Decrees" and in the "Covenant of Life and Grace," together with the corresponding duty of obedience to God and energetic use of the "Means of Grace" and of prayer. In this scheme, Christ and the Holy Spirit appear merely as instruments for the accomplishment of the covenant of life and grace and the decrees. What a contrast this is to the Heidelberg Catechism! The latter goes out from mankind's need of comfort. Its contents are sin and grace, salvation, justification, sanctification and glorification. It describes not the accomplishment of the divine plans, but the story of salvation. The difference between the two Catechisms can be seen at a glance. But is it pure contrast? Further, is the Genevan Catechism also theocentric? And is it to be classed, in this respect, with the Shorter Catechism?

² See E. F. Karl Müller, "Entstehung und Bedeutung des Heid. Kat." *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung*, 1914, No. 3.

The latter appears to me to be far from true. I certainly do not wish to deny that the Shorter Catechism is filled with the spirit of Calvin. But it does not comprehend the whole of Calvin, for, if there is one result of modern investigation which is assured, it is that Calvinism, like the *ellipse*, has not *one* but *two* centers. On the one side, stands the sovereign God, who from all eternity chose and rejected, for the working out of whose plans everything in church and state and world—yes even sin and death—must serve. On the other side, is sinful humanity and Christ, who through his work on earth justifies and saves. The relation of these two centers to one another and their, it must be confessed, not always perfect organic combination—these give rise to the wealth of Calvin's theology. Here is its real worth also for our own age.

Both these Calvinistic points of view are truly represented in the Genevan Catechism. God, it is true, furnishes the point of departure as well as the general structural principle. But the exposition of the Creed, the comprehensive treatment of the doctrine of salvation and other sections offer a wealth of material drawn from Christ's saving work, which is not to be found in the Shorter Catechism. Calvin ever interpreted the eternal God in terms of Christ,³ and, as a result, the theocentric tendency of the Genevan Catechism does not cause the Christocentric feature to be lost sight of.

The two Calvinistic points of view appear also in the Heidelberg Catechism. It is true that the Christocentric tendency plays the leading role, but the theocentric principle is also there. This is especially true of the third part which contains the exposition of the Ten Commandments and of the Lord's Prayer. Here the stress falls upon God's majesty. He is the Lord who shares His honor with none of His creatures—the Being to whom we should look up in humble fear and obedient spirit (cf. Q. 94–100, 117, 120–122, 125, 128). The real significance of these sections clearly appears only when they are

³ See one of the very first sentences of the Genevan Catechism: *Fiduciae in Deo collocandae fundamentum ac principium est, eum in Christo novisse.*

compared with the corresponding parts of Luther's Catechisms. If nevertheless, again and again, one continues to insist upon the anthropocentric and Christocentric character of the Heidelberg Catechism, there is only a double justification for so doing: first, the frequent references to Christ's work of reconciliation in His suffering and death and to His precious blood which has fully satisfied for all our sins (Q. 1, 12-16, 31, 34, 37, 40, 42, 43, 56, 61, 66-81). Second, the significant way in which the Catechism is divided into three parts. Man's misery, redemption and thankfulness. Under these three headings the contents are grouped with reference to man's need and his salvation in Christ. Indeed this gives to the Catechism a devotional tone which has no parallel in Calvin.

The reference to the threefold division brings us to another question. This division which appears first in Ursinus' shorter catechism is due, consciously or unconsciously, to Luther's influence. And the second particularity which we found, the emphasis upon Christ's cross and work of reconciliation, was a favorite thought, strongly insisted upon and often repeated by Olevianus, who was at once a strict Calvinist and a German. In view of these facts, it has often been said, that the Calvinistic ideas received in the Heidelberg Catechism a German temper, a German drapery. Indeed, that a certain German tone is present is undeniable. In the widely scattered Churches which owe their origin to Calvin the Heidelberg Catechism represents the German spirit. It is a German interpretation of Calvinistic Reformed piety.

This German element, however, must not be exaggerated. It explains much, but by no means all. Take, for example, that feature which has always been regarded as constituting the most marked difference between the Heidelberg Catechism and Calvin. I refer to the entire absence from the Catechism of an expressed doctrine of election and predestination. It was present in the two earlier drafts, but was allowed to drop out of the final recension. How did this happen? Does this silence indicate a doubt concerning this doctrine, which was

central for Calvin? In review of such utterances as Questions 20, 21, 64, 84, and, above all, Questions 53 and 54, and in view of the later utterances of the authors, especially of Ursinus in his Commentary on the Catechism, we must answer, No. In my opinion, the correct answer must be sought in the connection of the Heidelberg Catechism with the earlier catechetical literature. This literature, standing as it did under Bucer's influence, had emphasized more and more the distinction between the faith of the community and its theological formulation, between religion and theology. The former, as distinct from the latter, ought to form the contents of a Catechism. Hence in the Catechisms of Zürich and Strassburg and, to a certain extent, even in the Geneva Catechisms, the doctrine of predestination was regarded as a matter for scientific theology. This explains, why, in the Heidelberg Catechism, predestination is presupposed, but not specifically taught.

Here, in my opinion, is the principal factor in the difference which exists between the Heidelberg Catechism and Calvin. I have no wish to minimize the importance of the anthropocentric and Christocentric character of the Catechism nor its German setting. I repeat, however, that the weightiest factor is, that the authors of our Catechism, standing upon the shoulders of their predecessors in the catechetical field, succeeded in laying bare the kernel of the Calvinistic system, freed from the theological husk, better than did Calvin himself. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to suppose that the Heidelberg Catechism exhausted itself in mere feeling. On the contrary, it is marked by practical insight and sound doctrine. Wherever the Catechism has taken root, it has fulfilled a threefold office; it was a book of instruction for the young, a confession of faith for the community and an introduction to theology. These three qualities have been of great importance. They have helped to produce a Reformed theology without cool and sterile orthodoxy, have prevented theological

ignorance on the part of the laity, and have bound all classes together in a conscious, practical Christianity.⁴

The eternal truths of religion and their theological expression never coincide. New generations express the old truths in new terms. Hence there may be some who object that even the Heidelberg Catechism contains too much sixteenth-century theology. However this may be, there is one thing, that must be acknowledged: that is, that among all confessions of the Reformed Church our Catechism is the purest and simplest statement of genuine Calvinistic piety with its exposition of the Biblical revelation of salvation.

IV.

Conforming to Biblical revelation of salvation—with this I touch finally upon that side of the religious and theological peculiarity of our Catechism, which was to its fathers by far the most important. They founded—like real Protestants—its truths not upon the authority of a man, however revered, neither on that of Calvin, nor Luther, nor Zwingli. But they believed their Catechism to be “sufficiently armed with God’s Word,” referring to the numerous passages of Scripture which were quoted in the margin of the first editions. Can we at the present time share their confidence that the Catechism offers to our Church the best exposition of the divine revelation of salvation laid down in Holy Scripture? How do we judge its Biblical character?

The Heidelberg Catechism, as we all know, gives nowhere a doctrine concerning the authority and the contents of Holy Scripture. This is in itself a deficiency, but in view of the present situation I should see in it an advantage. Of course, in teaching, this want must be filled by a thorough introduction into the history of salvation. But now no theory about verbal inspiration and such like prevents such an introduction into the understanding of the Bible, as is suitable to the sound Biblical research of our days. The Catechism is very well

⁴ Cf. Karl Müller, *l. c.*, p. 18.

in harmony with the deepened historical view of the progress of divine revelation which is reached to-day.

In reference to the contents of Scripture, the Heidelberg Catechism, like the whole reformation, represents St. Paul's view of the Gospel. Not only justification, faith as a working of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of repentance and conversion, but also the most attacked doctrines of the Catechism about the complete depravity of the natural man through sin and original sin, about the bodily resurrection, the wrath of God and reconciliation through the cross and sufferings of the Savior, in short, Christology, are covered by the authority of St. Paul. Certainly, there are some not unimportant differences, but they do not matter so very much, if one looks on the whole. In general, the Catechism has succeeded in presenting not dry formulas of doctrine, but, like St. Paul's Gospel itself, in describing the salvation of the redeemed sinner in Christ with all the reality of personal experience. Of course, from this commendation, the construction of the doctrine of the twofold nature in Questions twelve to seventeen—acknowledged to be one of the weakest parts of the Catechism—ought perhaps to be excluded. On the other hand Question twenty-one about the essence of true faith is a model of Biblical truth in its uniting the things pertaining to knowledge and things pertaining to the will with the chief stress on sincere confidence. This praise is not even weakened by the following question which leads on to the explanation of the Apostles' Creed. For if it says there: "What is it necessary for a Christian to believe? All that is promised us in the Gospel"—this does not mean a dead thinking of it as true, but the reception of the promises of the Gospel by head and heart. Again, if the Catechism speaks so often of the payment of the guilt of sin through the sacrifice of Christ, this does not mean the satisfaction-theory of Anselm, but rather St. Paul's religious message of the Crucified One who became sin for us, so that we might become in Him the righteousness before God. Thus I might mention much more. But what I have just said suffices to

show that he who rejects the Heidelberg Catechism account of the above mentioned doctrines, must at the same time expel St. Paul from the Church.

But one can hear to-day on many sides, that the Reformation and also the Heidelberg Catechism are in any case put in the wrong through the newer knowledge of the essential difference between the Gospel of St. Paul and the Gospel of the original Jesus of Nazareth. St. Paul, it is said, has falsified this genuine Christianity of Christ, the real historical picture of Jesus with its simple human features, through his preaching about the Crucified and Risen Son of God. Of course, I cannot here with a few words settle this weighty question which goes to the root of our whole Evangelical Christianity. But I must say this much: Whatever one may think about the relation between Jesus and St. Paul, in no case can one construct a fundamental difference between the two without a difficult critical operation. The Gospels, as they are before us now, the Synoptists as well as John, are by no means favorable to the thesis that St. Paul does not teach the original Gospel of Christ. One always speaks of "overpaintings" which have to be extinguished first, in order that the golden ground of the original picture of Jesus may shine forth. But in reference to these critical operations not even a remote agreement has been reached hitherto. On the contrary, in the scientific researches a varied collection of opinions reveals itself from the total denial of the very existence of Jesus to the most conservative attitude to our problems. But now, how should a Catechism, a book for the people, a book of confession for the Church, venture on such shaky ground? Why should it for this sake surrender St. Paul's view of salvation, the faith of the Reformers that made Protestantism great?

Yet admitting that the ground principles of the Catechism, St. Paul's view of the Gospel, have not nearly been shaken to such an extent as to make a rebuilding necessary or even possible—one may pretend all the more plausibly that a number of aspects of Biblical salvation truth, especially important for

the present time, have not been brought out sufficiently in the Heidelberg Catechism. Above all, it is said, the great thought of Jesus about the Kingdom of God has been valued too little. The Catechism, too individualistic and other worldly, is only concerned about the salvation of the individual soul, but forgets the social demands of the Gospel. In opposition to this I should like to remark, that a book as ancient as the Heidelberg Catechism, is, of course, not cut to the constantly changing wants of the time. At all times, therefore, in the exposition and application of the Catechism, certain sides of its doctrine have been pointed out more strongly, and others have been allowed to stand back. So in our days in connection with Questions fifty-four ("out of the whole human race"), or going back to the command for baptism, the mission to the heathen must be considered more specially. Not less with Question thirty-two ("with free conscience fight against sin and the Devil in this life"), Question fifty-five (communion of saints), and especially with Question one hundred and seven (love toward our fellow-men), and Questions one hundred and ten and one hundred and eleven (eighth commandment), sufficient occasion is offered to engender a social mind. But as a matter of principle the following may be mentioned especially: Complaints similar to such as we have heard about the Heidelberg Catechism are being uttered also about the Westminster Catechism. And yet the latter was drawn up just at the time when Puritanism under Cromwell made the greatest attempt known in the whole history of Protestantism, to set up the Kingdom of Christ by means of social and civic reconstruction. This attempt was made in spite of the seemingly unsocial and unpolitical character of the Catechism. The attempt very soon failed; why? Because England could not be changed at short notice into a kingdom of saints. Politics and social economy have their own laws; their evolution follows their own necessities. Their transformation can only be brought about by degrees from within, when the people themselves are transformed. But a Christian must nevertheless

not become indifferent to social conditions; one social order is certainly more favorable to Christianity than another. But the decisive influence comes about less through social and political progress than through strong Christian personalities, who take their Christianity wholly seriously also in things economical. The strength of Christianity, and very especially of evangelical Christianity, is and remains its individualism, its ability to form men who will lead a godly life under all circumstances. Therefore we would rather see an advantage in the Heidelberg Catechism limiting itself to the way of salvation and personal Christianity, but standing aloof from politics and social economy. In spite of the Kingdom of God idea this attitude conforms also to the New Testament. One has only to think of Jesus' rejection of the Messianic political hopes of his people, of St. Paul's attitude in regard to slavery and many other things.

These remarks can according to their nature give only brief directions on the important topics treated therein. However, I think, I may sum up thus: The religious and theological peculiarity of the Heidelberg Catechism is deeply founded on the Bible, even far more decidedly than that of pure Calvinism. On this fact we may also found our hopes for the future. In Germany Calvinism at the present time is being increasingly valued and appreciated. This appreciation must in the end also turn to the German product of the Calvinistic Reformation in spite of all the modern dislike of every kind of Catechism. But we who know the value of our Heidelberg Catechism may willingly work at it and for it both theoretically and practically. May God to this end richly bless this jubilee meeting!

HALLE, GERMANY.

V.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HEIDELBERG CATE-
CHISM ON THE RELIGIOUS AND CHURCH
LIFE AND PIETY OF THE PEOPLE
OF BERN.¹

W. HADORN.

The 350th Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism has given occasion to the origin of various articles and books that bear upon the history of this important Catechism, and also upon its circulation and use in the Reformed Churches of the old and new world. The erudition and researches of prominent writers—I mention Profs. A. Lange, of Halle; E. F. K. Miller, of Erlangen; James I. Good, of Philadelphia—show to the Reformed Church what a treasure was given by God in this little book. But the history of the influence which this Catechism exercised upon the growing generations of the Reformed Church in the different centuries cannot very easily be written because of the lack of the right kind of material. This became very clear to me as I endeavored to gather the material for only a comparatively small territory of the Reformed Church, so that I might answer the seemingly important question, “What influence has the Heidelberg Catechism exercised upon the religious life and thought of the people”? There can be no doubt as to the existence of such influence, just as we recognize the influence of the Holy Scriptures, for the Heidelberg Catechism has been one of the most widely circulated and used books for centuries. In the pastoral work

¹ A paper by the Rev. Prof. W. Hadorn, D.D., pastor at the Reformed Cathedral in Bern, Switzerland. It was translated from the German by the Rev. B. S. Stern, D.D., and read before the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, at Lancaster, Pa., on the 13th of May, 1914.

in various rural and city congregations I could notice the influence of this book, especially in the case of the older generations that had been instructed according to the Heidelberg Catechism. The younger generation, apparently, does not know the Heidelberg at all, or only from hearsay, since it has fallen into disuse in many of our congregations for reasons which cannot be enlarged upon in this paper. We may regret this; nevertheless, it is true. I am all the more anxious to show what this influence is ere this last Heidelberg generation shall pass away and I am fully aware of the difficulties which present themselves in the endeavor to present this matter. Who can venture to assert that certain forms of religious life and experiences of faith and loyalty are the result of instruction given along the lines of the Heidelberg Catechism? To ask the question would almost seem like giving up all claim of being able to present the proof. For this reason I must beg the readers not to expect too much but to consider the following statements as an attempt which might be taken up by some more competent person with a prospect of greater success.

May I be permitted, in the first place, to present some facts with reference to the introduction of the Heidelberg, or Palatinate Catechism in Switzerland, especially in the Canton of Bern. The Heidelberg Catechism, which has become more of a bond of religious life for the Reformed people of Switzerland than any other confession of faith, can be traced back to the beginning of the 17th century in Switzerland. The various cantonal churches had their own Catechisms and were not inclined to give them up readily. The introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism was due, in the first place, to its own superiority and adaptability so that the clergymen began to use it along with the officially recognized Catechisms. And after it was once in use, although not officially introduced, it grew in favor until it finally took first rank.

Frickert² says concerning this: "As to the time when the Palatinate Catechism was introduced in the churches and

² *Beitraege zur Geschichte der Kirche in ehemaligen Kanton Bern*—1846.

schools of the Canton Bern, there seems to be as much uncertainty in Bern itself as there is concerning the introduction of the Lobwasser Psalms, which became known about the same time as the Heidelberg Catechism. This uncertainty may be due to the fact that this Catechism was not introduced by any act of the cantonal government but quietly came into use with the tacit consent of the civil and church courts."

The earliest date which we have for the use of the Heidelberg Catechism in Bern is 1616. In this year the court of the small Council of Bern issued a school order for the city and Canton of Bern in which the use of the Heidelberg Catechism was definitely enjoined. In the lowest class the Creed and the Lord's Prayer were to be taught; in the second the institution of the Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper; in the third class the first part of the Heidelberg, and in the following the whole of the Catechism was to be committed to memory. It is true this did not refer so much to the village schools, but chiefly to the Academy of Bern called the "High School," and the so-called literary or Latin schools in Bern and in other cities of the Canton (Frickert).

Consequently, the Heidelberg Catechism was in use in the Bernese country when the Synod of Dort declared it to be the recognized book of the Reformed Churches. This action, naturally, aided very much in the circulation of this Catechism and also the fact that many of the well known theologians, after completing their course in the Academy of Bern, attended the University at Heidelberg. About this time, too, various efforts were made to establish rural schools, into which the Heidelberg was introduced as the religious school-book. In the year 1622 Prof. Nicholas Haenzi, professor of Greek in Bern, published a Heidelberg Catechism in Latin with passages of Scripture, which was to serve for the preparation of the teachers.

Nevertheless, the small Bern Catechism continued to be used. In fact both Catechisms were in use and it was decreed that they should be committed to memory. The Bern Cate-

chism was the shorter and smaller. The Palatinate Catechism, on the other hand, submitted the Reformed doctrine in acceptable form.

In the editions issued by the Bern government an addition to the 27th question was made as follows: "God is in no wise the cause of sin," the desire being to avoid any statement that might appear to weaken the thought of God's loving providence. With this slight change the Catechism was officially introduced in the German and also the French parts of the Canton.

In connection with the history of the Heidelberg Catechism it is also of interest to know that in 1619 a third and still shorter Catechism was issued, the title being: "Short Christian Instruction in God's Word intended for parents who desire to have their children baptized, for sponsors, communicants, etc." In this shorter Catechism the 80th question of the Heidelberg was used verbatim. In some of the schools the three Catechisms could be found bound up in one volume. Later on (1702–1748) we hear of two only, the small Bern and the Palatinate Catechisms. The order of worship of this latter date contains the instruction: "In the instruction of the children no other books shall be used in our churches than those which have been adopted, namely, the Bern and the Heidelberg Catechism."

The standing which the Heidelberg Catechism obtained explains the fact that not only learned commentaries but also popular explanations appeared. I mention the following commentaries by Bernese writers besides the one by Prof. Haenzi referred to above:

Prof. R. Rudolph—Dekan in Bern (1697), Latin.

Joh. Altmann—Professor in Bern (1711).

Joh. Ganting—*Explanation of the Heidelberg Catechism*, Bern (1794).

Pastor Jacob Schweitzer—Bern (1815) (2 volumes).

Pastor Wittenbach—*Explanation of the Heidelberg*.

David Mueslin—Associate Pastor of the Cathedral—Bern.

Samuel Ziegler—*Heidelberg Catechism*, Bern (1827).

F. F. Zyro—Professor in Bern (1848).

It is well known what the Heidelberg Catechism teaches with reference to ex-communication, as the 85th question and answer speaks of those who have been repeatedly warned, etc. Nevertheless, the church of Bern never introduced ex-communication. This particular passage of the Heidelberg Catechism was never questioned but it was never carried out in practice and nothing was said about this strong contradiction. In his explanation Zyro says: "This," namely the ex-communication, "has often been attempted, but these efforts were of short duration because of many difficulties. In small companies it might be carried out, but not easily in a general way except in unusual cases." However, it was attempted by various church-courts in the seventeenth century, as Frickert shows, and certain persons were suspended from the Lord's Supper according to the 85th question and answer until they showed a real amendment of their life. Some rigorous pastors refused the privilege of participating in the Lord's Supper to some offending members of their flocks. This gave occasion to long and continued case of discipline. A certain class wanted to introduce ex-communication in 1645, but without success.

And now a few words as to the use of the Catechism. The Children's Services that came into use after the Synod of Dort were intended to make the children acquainted with the Bible, the Song-Book and the Catechism. Being conducted during the summer at first, there soon followed services in the winter season also. The mandate, dated May 15, 1664, makes these services obligatory. The school teachers thus had the opportunity of instructing the children on Sunday also. From the middle of March until the end of October the pastor would conduct the Children's Service. The Catechism was used for fundamental instruction by both.

We notice that in all these regulations the government endeavored earnestly and faithfully to introduce the Catechism. This effort was successful, too, so that it became a part of the very life of the people.

And now as to the influence of the Catechism upon the piety and the religious life and thought of the Bernese people. Basing the assertion upon our own experience and competent witnesses, we claim that it was a very great influence. The fact that a whole people had been studying and learning the Heidelberg Catechism by heart during two centuries and thereby were led into the religious truth of Christianity, not only in the church instruction but also in the school, speaks for itself. The catechumens were expected to be able to recite the questions and answers, otherwise they were not permitted to be confirmed. And as that which is memorized in early life remains in the memory the longest, so the contents of the Heidelberg Catechism really became the foundation of the religious conceptions and also of the piety of our people. No other Reformed symbol has ever brought about such results. These symbols were theological, which were seldom, if ever, read in the churches. The Heidelberg was a *People's Symbol* which was received in the most beautiful and important time of life—in youth. Its truths were not apprehended by all to the same extent, by many only externally; nevertheless, by thousands with blessing and permanent profit.

The Bernese theological professor, Frederick Zyro (1802–1874), in 1848 wrote in the introduction to his *Hand-book to the Heidelberg Catechism* (page 9) that “he had learned this Catechism by heart many times during his school years, and in the ten years of his pastoral work had explained it over and over, and in the twenty-six semesters in which he had been teaching he had used it in the catechetical instruction of the students and also in special lectures for the theological students.” In this testimony the statement that he had memorized the Catechism in his school-years a number of times is of special interest. It gives us an idea as to the thoroughness with which the Heidelberg Catechism was taught. Prof. Zyro was not the only one who could say that it contained his confession of faith. And if he does admit that some things in the Catechism do not seem so important for our day and generation

as they were 300 years ago, and some things might be changed or amended, yet he confesses that this Catechism contains his confession of faith and that its value lies in its clearness and conciseness. That is but one testimony of many.

We may also call attention to the fact that the Heidelberg Catechism in its peculiar diction corresponds with the *character of the Bernese people* in a marked manner. A certain Hexameter, whose author and origin is unknown, expresses this congeniality very nicely in the words: "Gens Ursina tenax semper Ursini libelli." The question might be asked: "Wherein does this congeniality consist?" I call attention to the fact. It is well known that the Heidelberg Catechism puts the doctrine of pre-destination in the background, for practical and other reasons. The book thus, whilst very positive as to confession, is also very conciliatory. In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper it is very apparent that there was an earnest desire to bridge over the various differences and the explanation of the dogmatic problems, in general, is more ethical than metaphysical. In all of these features it met a real need of the Bernese people. It would take up too much space to endeavor to show that at Calvin's time, the people of Bern were not inclined to busy themselves with the subtle differences as to election and instructed their representatives to the Synod of Dort accordingly. It is not surprising, therefore, that a Catechism that took this position should be very welcome to the Bernese people, especially because of its peculiar tendency and its very practical contents. The religious life of the Bernese people has always seemed to be of a practical nature. Bern has not produced a single prominent systematic theologian. Since the Heidelberg Catechism was more than a mere textbook, as it was a devotional book written in beautiful style and inspiring in its confession of faith, it was but natural that these people should see in it that which might be called flesh of their flesh and spirit of their spirit and, therefore, learn to love it.

Its practical style, noticeable especially in the more difficult questions—for instance the 35th—made it quite possible

for the Heidelberg Catechism to be used by laymen, especially school teachers in the Sunday Children's Service, and in the school. Naturally, a great deal depended on the ability of the teacher. In the circles of the so-called Heimberger Brethren (eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) the Heidelberg Catechism was used as the foundation of their utterances in their village meetings. As all of the hearers had learned the questions by heart in school, they were familiar with the matter and the answers would form the text of the catechizer. So far as I know, at the present time there are no more such Sunday Children's Services conducted by teachers. In the gatherings of the "Christian Fellowship Circles" the Heidelberg Catechism has been crowded out. I had the good fortune of hearing their teacher, Mr. Christian Schwarz, who is one of their most talented representatives, explain the 20th answer of the Heidelberg Catechism in one of the so-called "Brother Villages" of the Heimberger Brethren and was very much impressed to note how the Heidelberg Catechism had influenced the religious life of the typical Bernese believers in the "State Church." Those who have been nourished by the Heidelberg Catechism have had the very means by which they were protected against unhealthy fanaticism and the like.

They declared very emphatically that in their devotional meetings no other truth should be taught but that which is contained in the Helvetic Confession of 1566, and in the Heidelberg Catechism. These brethren all declared that they would not speak about the free will of man or about his being able to make himself better of his own accord in these meetings; but would endeavor, by the word of God and the symbols of the church, to show the seeking souls that above all they must seek the Saviour, Jesus Christ. For without Him they could do nothing, neither awaken true repentance nor faith, because experience teaches that all false doctrines and sects have arisen, when people have endeavored to find their salvation or blessedness without Christ.³ In harmony with the Heidelberg Cate-

³ See Hadorn, *History of Swiss Pietism*, 349-55.

chism another leader among these Brethren wrote a poem based upon the 10th Commandment as the rule of the new life. I also want to call attention to the fact that the sects that exist in our canton have usually been opposed to the Heidelberg Catechism. In other words, the Heidelberg Catechism has fostered the piety of the Bernese people and hindered the spread of various sects. The sugar-coated individualistic piety found no nourishment in it.

What is true of the pietists of the church is true to an even larger extent of the entire church population, as Bloesch explains: "As to the religious conviction in general, as to the faith of the Reformed people, the Heidelberg Catechism is unquestionably of greater importance than any of the Latin confessions, which are only known by the theologians and not always understood by these." It must be admitted that the Heidelberg Catechism was merely a school-book for the greater part of the school youth, and laid aside as soon as school was finished to be touched as seldom as any other school-book. In this respect it shares the same fate as other Catechisms, but a person cannot lay aside what has been committed to memory and it has often been shown that especially the older and sick people were greatly comforted by questions of the Heidelberg and that many a sick and dying person would cling to the "only comfort in life and in death"—very much as the poems and odes of Gellert, used in the schools in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, were a source of great comfort. In many a pastoral call, some question of the Heidelberg Catechism afforded the introduction to the conversation.

During the nineteenth century opposition to the Heidelberg Catechism developed. This was a part of the greater movement to sever the connection between the church and the schools. To the opponents the Heidelberg Catechism appeared to be the embodiment of this system and from a pedagogical viewpoint they argued against the method of memorizing, or learning by heart. Undoubtedly, however, the underlying reason for this

opposition was in the position of the rationalistic teachers in their opposition to the Gospel and also to the Heidelberg Catechism.⁴

However, it would be unjust to put all the blame upon the school and the teachers. During the period of rationalism the Heidelberg Catechism had fallen into disuse in many of the churches. In some of the cantons its use has been discontinued since 1798, and thus it was crowded out more and more in the Canton of Bern also, being supplanted by other Catechisms. The revision of the Heidelberg Catechism by Dekan Gueter, authorized by a synodical committee, was short-lived. Thus the number of congregations in which the Heidelberg was used decreased from one decade to another. At the present time there are only about 20 congregations left. In our undogmatic age it appears like the armor of Saul to our young theologians. However, what the modern times are offering as a substitute does not compare with it in force and pointedness, and we dare not deny that there is a strong desire that the truth of the Heidelberg might be expressed in other words and continued to be used. Unto the Bernese people it brought great blessing as long as in the providence of God it was permitted to do so.

BERN, SWITZERLAND.

⁴ Jeremias Gotthelf submits the following: The statement was made in the presence of the school children; "This book," the Heidelberger namely, "ought to be burned" (*Zeit Geist und Berner Geist*, II, 3).

VI.

“WHAT MEAN YE BY THESE STONES?”¹

JAMES I. GOOD.

The story of this book of Joshua begins and ends with stones. In my text, at its beginning, the question is asked “What mean ye by these stones?” What stones are referred to? When the Israelites under Joshua had passed over the Jordan, the Lord ordered Joshua to choose twelve men to place twelve stones in the bed of the Jordan river where the feet of the priests had stood when Israel passed over the river. And Joshua, as he called the men to do this, said “This may be to you as sign that when your children ask their fathers in time to come ‘What mean ye by these stones?’ Then shall ye answer them that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord when it passed over Jordan and these stones shall be for a memorial unto the children of Israel forever.”

And also when we turn to the end of this book of Joshua, we find that Joshua twenty-four years afterward gathered the twelve tribes at Shechem and wrote these words in the book of the law of God and took up a great stone and set it up there under an oak and said “Behold this stone shall be a witness unto us.”

Indeed not only the book of Joshua, but the whole Old Testament is full of stones that were set up as memorials. Jacob repeatedly set up stones as at Bethel, Samuel set up the stone Ebenezer. And this has been true ever since in the

¹ Joshua 4: 6. The opening sermon at the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, preached by the retiring president, the Rev. Prof. James I. Good, D.D., LL.D., at Lancaster, Pa., on the 12th of May, 1914.

Church of Christ. She has had her milestones of history. In 313, just 1,600 years ago last year, the Emperor Constantine granted toleration to Christians by the Edict of Milan. That marked a new epoch in the history of the church. The reformation in the sixteenth century was another milestone of the Church's history. Other milestones might be mentioned, were there time.

In our own Reformed Church let us pause to look for a moment.

Stone the first (1714), the first German Reformed Church founded in America by Rev. John Henry Haeger at Germanna Ford in the Rapidan river, Virginia.

Stone the second (1725), Rev. John Philip Boehm organized the three first congregations in Pennsylvania of which the Falkner Swamp remains.

Stone the third (1747), Rev. Michael Schlatter organized the scattered Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania into a coetus.

Stone the fourth (1793), the Reformed Coetus became independent of the Reformed Church of Holland and organized itself into a synod. Perhaps we might pause a moment to look at this stone, seeing we are gathered in the same congregation at Lancaster where this took place 120 years ago on April 27, 1793. It was a small company that gathered here then, only 13 ministers representing 78 congregations, 15,000 members and about 40,000 adherents. They were a small company as after they had heard the opening sermon in the Reformed Church on Sunday they went the next day in solemn procession to the Reformed parochial schoolhouse here for their sessions. That little school house would not hold this General Synod of to-day. For the 13 ministers have grown to 1,201, the 78 congregations to 1,759, the 40,000 adherents to perhaps a million. But as we sit here we can pause a moment to hear their roll call, Hendel, Helfrich, Pauli, Rahauser, Wagner, Wack, Winckhaus

“Of all the pious dead
May we the footsteps trace
Till with them in the land of light
We dwell before Thy face.”

Stone the fifth, 1863. But let us pass on to the organization of our General Synod fifty years ago last year. And this brings me to the anniversaries that have come upon us since the last General Synod at Canton, Ohio, in 1911. Since that time five anniversaries have taken place. I have therefore chosen as my theme for this occasion “Our Anniversaries and their Lessons.” Of these anniversaries, three are closely linked together. The first was the anniversary of the organization of the General Synod in 1863. The other two closely connected with it were the fiftieth anniversary of both the Home Mission and Sunday School Boards. The Foreign Board could also have held its fiftieth anniversary but it preferred holding its seventy-fifth anniversary last year.

Let us pause on the first of these as no formal anniversary of the organization of our General Synod has as yet been held. In 1863 the Reformed Church, which split in 1824 into an eastern and western synod, united again to form our General Synod. This had been preceded by negotiations for nineteen years, ever since the first Triennial Convention between the Dutch and German Reformed had been held in 1844. The first meeting of the General Synod was held at Pittsburgh on November 18, 1863. The inspiration to it came doubtless from the great Tercentenary Convention held in Philadelphia in January of that year. The meeting was held in the midst of the excitements and anxieties of our awful civil war. Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D., was elected president. That General Synod was composed of 99 members, of whom 68 were ministers. Of the ministers enrolled there are living today, as far as I can find out, Revs. Messrs. Gantenbein, Zieber, P. Prugh, Swander and Eli Keller. The rest have passed into the General Assembly and Church of the firstborn above. The statistics of the next year (1864) give 460 ministers, 1,134 congregations, 107,394 mem-

bers. There is no doubt that the organization of the General Synod, which brought east and west together, was a powerful factor in the spread of our Church. It was a union fraught with great results. Since then sixteen General Synods have been held and we are now gathered at another, the eighteenth General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. May the great Head of the Church give us wisdom for the great problems that are before us and use us in this synod for his greater glory and the Church's wider spread.

In connection with the fifteenth anniversary of the General Synod, two other anniversaries appear: The anniversary of our Home Mission Board which was held last November in the city of Philadelphia, at which excellent addresses were delivered and an inspiring spirit produced. The Sunday School Board also could have its anniversary. But as that Board, though established by our General Synod in 1863, did not get under way until 1893 its anniversary was not specially noted. The seventy-fifth anniversary of the Foreign Mission Board was also held last October, linking it with its earlier organization under the American Board in 1838. At this meeting excellent addresses were delivered on its history and work.

Having thus reviewed the anniversaries of our own Church, we now take up another anniversary, not of our own Church alone, but of all the Reformed Churches holding to the Heidelberg Catechism. This anniversary has been observed in a greater or less degree all over the world. Last September I attended the session of the Reformed Alliance of Germany whose delegate, Rev. Prof. A. Lang, is at our General Synod today to bring us its greetings. And there they devoted considerable time to the observance of the 350th Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism. According to the plan proposed by the committees of our different synods (they had to do this, as the last General Synod had not appointed any committee on the celebration), the closing exercises of this anniversary of our Catechism are to come at this General Synod and they will be held the latter part of to-morrow afternoon and to-

morrow evening. Although many addresses and sermons have been delivered on the Catechism during 1913, yet this is the only occasion when our Church, in its entirety and through its representatives from all parts of the Church, observes this anniversary. Our observance of it has therefore a unique significance. In connection with this anniversary and as a prelude to what is to come to-morrow, permit me to call your attention to a scene in connection with our catechism, that is seems to me our Church has not made enough of. It is so important that it is a question whether it ought not to be our Reformed Reformation day instead of January 19 which commemorates the publication of the Catechism.

Two dates appear in connection with this, May 12 and May 14. What is the meaning of these mystic numbers May 12-May 14? I will read them over again only inverting their order: May 14, 1566, May 12, 1914 (to-night), just 348 years between them. On May 14, 1566, what was the scene? The scene was the most critical moment in the history of our catechism and also the grandest. It was the defence of Elector Frederick III of the Palatinate at Augsburg 1566. May 14 ought ever be a sacred date to those who love our catechism. For on that date the greatest public event in its history took place. I had hoped to spend the whole evening on this one scene, but at the suggestion of the local committee I have also included the other anniversaries that I have mentioned. And they have taken so much time that for a complete description of Frederick's Defence I must refer you to my new work on the Heidelberg Catechism. I can only give the merest outline of it, especially in the new light that has come upon it in the last fifty years which has greatly enhanced the credit of Elector Frederick and the magnificence of the scene.

The opposition to the Heidelberg Catechism had after two years culminated in the calling of Frederick to the bar of the German diet to answer for the publication of his book. That

diet opened with great splendor on March 25, 1566. We plain Americans know nothing of the glitter and grandeur of such a scene. Some years ago a friend of mine saw a royal wedding in London. His description of it was that Solomon in all his glory was far eclipsed. Such was the splendor of that Diet of Augsburg. But a more splendid scene than the diet itself occurred in Frederick's Defence.

For Frederick had not been present when it opened. Nor though late did he come too early. Already before he arrived, the opponents of his catechism, led by the two Lutheran dukes of Wurtemberg and Zweibrucken, had attempted to pack the Protestant States against him. In this they were silently supported by the Catholics. These however hesitated to act, because this was a matter for the Protestants to settle among themselves. When Frederick arrived, he found that the two hostile dukes had attempted to send a statement to the Emperor without his signature. This would have ostracized him. They did this, claiming that he was a Calvinist and not a Lutheran and that the German law recognized only Lutherans. And but for the opposition of one man, the Elector of Saxony, this ostracism would have been carried out. When Frederick arrived, he at once went to the Saxon Elector and offered to sign the statement to the Emperor. The Saxon Elector made this known to the two hostile dukes. They declared that he could not sign it until he had signed a Lutheran formula that they had prepared. But the Saxon Elector startled them by saying he himself could not sign that formula. For the Lutheran Church of that day was bitterly divided into two parts, the high-Lutherans and the Melancthonians, and the two dukes were high-Lutherans while the Saxon Elector was a Melancthonian. He therefore declared that if they by this formula shut out the Calvinists, they must also shut out the doctrine of ubiquity which was the shibboleth of the high-Lutherans. Thus the Protestant princes failed to come to any agreement against Frederick.

But while the Protestants were thus dividing, a new power

entered the field which made Frederick's position the more critical. For what the Protestants could not do, the Catholics now proposed to do. And they found a weak Lutheran prince, Margrave Philibert, of Baden, who had had a quarrel with Frederick, to lead their efforts. For as Catholics they could not legally interfere with Protestants. But this prince gave them a shadow of legal protection against Frederick. This brought about the most serious situation possible for Frederick and his catechism.

For another element entered. It has hitherto been supposed that the Emperor Maximilian, the most liberal of the German Emperors of that age, was lenient to Frederick at this trial. But recent researches, especially by Kluckhohn, the biographer of Elector Frederick III, have shown to our surprise, that the Emperor was a leader against Frederick. For some reason or other Maximilian was bitterly opposed to the use of the Heidelberg Catechism in Germany. And the Catholics having now laid their plan under the guise of a weak Protestant prince as we have seen, the Emperor proceeded to carry out the decree by forbidding to Frederick the use of the catechism in the Palatinate and ordering that if Frederick would not be obedient, his son Lewis, a Lutheran, was to be placed on the throne in his stead. You can thus see the tremendous odds against Frederick and the Catechism. It was in danger of being strangled at its birth. If it had, you and I would not be using this blessed book. It might have continued in use in Holland and Hungary, where it had already been introduced, but this decree of the Emperor, if adopted, would have been its death-knell in Germany, its main home. And the situation was still the more serious, because the only friend Frederick had there, the Saxon Elector, offered no public resistance to the decree. Who was there to save Frederick and his little book? No one—but Frederick himself. And he did it. Or better, only the providence of God produced a situation so that this book might become such a blessing to so many millions. Frederick realized the stu-

pendous crisis and rose with the crisis to a height that he nowhere else reached and that has never been anywhere else reached for the catechism.

After a quarter of an hour's deliberation, he re-entered the diet attended by his son John Casimir, and with his Bible before him he proceeded to its defense. This noble defence of Frederick is too long for me to give here. Nor can any mere reading of it give it its peculiarly striking historical setting. Suffice it to say, that he denied being a follower of Calvin, whose books he had not read. But he claimed to be a Bible-man. And on the basis of this, he asked the princes, yes even the Emperor, to show him a better way than his catechism. But while willing to accept the better way if shown to him, he closed with a declaration that no man can force another to do violence to his conscience. And when he said that, he took the whole subject out of the domain of law, even of the imperial law of Germany, and placed it in the higher domain of conscience. And then he capped the climax by closing with a declaration that he stood ready to be a martyr if necessary. For he comforted himself that for what he lost on earth, his Savior would more than make up, as he had promised, a hundred-fold in the life to come. His martyr spirit was only equalled and excelled when the translator of our catechism into Spanish went up in a chariot of fire like Elijah as a martyr in the flames of the inquisition at Toledo, Spain, in 1632, and when other Reformed, Dutch, German, Bohemian and Hungarian, gave up their lives for their catechism. This magnificent plea of Frederick is worthy to be placed alongside of Luther's defence at Worms when he declared "Here I stand. I can not do otherwise. God help me. Amen."

The effect of his address was so great that the diet was spell-bound. And then the Saxon Elector seized the psychological moment by saying: "Fritz you are more pious than all of us." Only one voice against him was lifted by the cardinal of Augsburg, who asked about the catechism calling the mass an idolatry and abomination. But the diet was so

much impressed by his address, that while before it was ready to condemn Frederick, now it halted and did nothing. And as they passed out of the hall, one of Frederick's friends, the Margrave Charles, of Baden, said to those standing around: "Why do we attack this prince, when he is more pious than we are." And that was the evident verdict on this wonderful defense. All honor to Frederick for his matchless defense. He did not compose our catechism though he influenced many of its answers. But he did more than that here. He saved it. For he defended it so magnificently that its use was continued.

But if we suppose that this great defense of Frederick's on May 14, 1566, was the end of the crisis we are mistaken. The diet continued several weeks longer. And the emperor, who seems to have been the most disappointed of all at the outcome of May 14, did everything to bring about the ostracism of Frederick and his catechism. Five days later he summoned the Protestant States to ask if they still recognized Frederick as one of their number. The Elector of Saxony had gone away, perhaps wisely, for he may have felt that Frederick's case could be better handled in another way and without his presence. But he had left behind him an astute statesman in his councillor Lindamuth. The latter begged the emperor for time, which he reluctantly granted. And in the meantime the delegates of the provinces of Hesse, Baden, Saxony solidified with those from the Palatinate against any action against Frederick. So that finally the Protestant princes, unable to unite in casting Frederick out, came to an agreement and delivered a declaration to the emperor that they were agreed on all the articles of the Augsburg Confession except the one on the Lord's Supper. And because they were agreed on so many points they could not shut Frederick out. But they assured the emperor that they would not allow any sect, Calvinistic or Zwinglian, to find a place in Germany. Thus Frederick was saved a second time.

But for their protection, he had to pass through a second

ordeal, from which he rose as wonderfully as he had done in the first. On May 24, 1566, ten days after his first defense, he was called before the Protestant States. His son John Casimir and his Bible were there with him also. These Protestant States now demanded, that as they had saved him from the Emperor, he must now agree to give up his peculiar views, which, they said, were more dangerous than anything that Calvin or Oecolampadius had taught. He then rose to his second great defense. Laying the Bible on the table before him, he urged all present to teach him something better out of the divine word. Had they been theologians they might have tried to do so, for theologians will often go where angels fear to tread. But they were all princes and not theologians. And they recognized two things about Frederick. The first was that he knew more about the Bible than any of them; and secondly that he was more spiritually-minded than any of them. They therefore did not dare to measure swords with him. The only answer they could give to him was silence and an adjournment of the whole subject.

Thus Frederick won the day a second time. Noble man—a nobleman indeed in his spirituality and life as well as in his birth. He towers above those princes, as Saul did head and shoulders above the people. Yes he and not Maximilian was for the moment the ruler of the German diet.

Too long perhaps I have dwelt on this memorable scene. Permit me now before closing briefly to draw some practical lessons from these anniversaries, for our Church and our time.

The first and the one that stands out most prominently in all this description is the *Prominence of the Bible*. On that Frederick grounded himself and could not therefore be answered. In both of the conferences at Augsburg he asked them to give him something better out of the Bible. For seven years, ever since 1559, when he received Melancthon's Opinion, he, though only a simple layman as he called himself, had been reading his Bible with strong crying and tears like his Master until it became a part of his very being. It was his

faith in the Bible that made him firm and strong. It has been said that our Heidelberg Catechism says less about the Bible than the other Reformed creeds. It is true it does not give a specific definition of the Bible as do some of the creeds. But it refers to it in answers 19 and 21. And what is more underneath it as its foundation is always the Word of God. The absolute truth of the Bible was taken for granted all the time. The Bible was so much taken for granted that it is not so often mentioned. That this is true is proved by Frederick's assertions at Augsburg. For Frederick there appeals to the abundance of its proof-texts. He says: "But that my catechism word for word is drawn not from human but from divine sources, the references that stand in the margin will show." The Heidelberg Catechism was full of the Bible and so was Frederick.

And so the Reformed Church, if she would be true to her history and to herself,—if she would be true to him who so grandly defended her at Augsburg, must cling to the authority of the Word of God. Anything that undermines the Bible or that dissipates its authority, whether in criticism or not, is contrary to the historic spirit of the Reformed Church. Frederick based his faith and his catechism on the Word of God and so should we. It will give a positive tone to our preaching and teaching. And what the world misses to-day is the positive note. There are too many negations uttered to-day in sermons. Faith is made largely a negation. Theology has often become full of negatives. Oh for more of that sublime faith of Frederick the Third. Then like him, we will make a splendid defense of our faith in this century as he did in his. And too those who went before us in organizing our General Synod fifty years ago had the same faith in the supreme authority of the Bible and none more so than its honored president, the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. For they placed this idea of the authority of the Bible in the constitution adopted by them. If therefore we would be true to their spirit and to the spirit of him who defended our catechism in 1566, we will

emphasize the authority of the Word of God. "The Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible."

A second lesson that comes to us from these anniversaries is the lesson of *Church-Unity*. This was the lesson of fifty years ago when the two synods of our Church united to form our General Synod—unity. This was the lesson of three and a half centuries ago. For Frederick published his Heidelberg Catechism so as to unite his divided people under one catechism. And at this diet of Augsburg his great aim was unity—the union of all the Protestants against the Romish princes. It was this idea of union that won to him the Elector of Saxony, who saved him at that diet. Unity! It is the lesson for to-day just as then. Church Union is in the air. There is not time for me to speak on it except to say that we may differ as to the method of union,—there are honest differences there which we must respect. But we can't escape the spirit of Union. It is in the air. It is the spiritual ozone of our religious atmosphere. The calls to union used to come to our Church occasionally one at a time. But at our General Synod six years ago, it came in three new ways. And again at this General Synod it will come to us in three new ways to say nothing of the old ones. And, my brethren, there is no greater problem before our Church or before any Church than Church Union in some form. The world at large demands it of us. The great Church of Christ as a whole demands it of us. Our Lord demands it of us, for he prayed for it. All the effort and all the money spent on it is well-spent. For it is a tremendous problem with many difficulties. But Church Union and the evangelization of the world are the two supreme problems before the Church at this time.

But there is another side of unity. I want to enter a plea for greater unity within our Church as well as with those outside. In our days there are often more differences within denominations than between them. Those within the same Church often find they have more in common with other denominations than with some of their own Church. What we need as

a denomination is more unity. Unity. I am reminded of this as I stand here in the Church where the Peace Commission was born in 1878. Some of us have forgotten a great fact that is staring our Church in the face. Some of our brethren are living in the past and not for the future. This great fact is that a Church with 300,000 communicants and perhaps a million of adherents is too large to be any longer a provincial Church, to be merely the Church of different institutions of learning or a Church of merely different synods. Our Church has been too much a merely institutional and synodical and provincial body. The time has come when the Church as a whole must rise up in its unity or she is unworthy of herself. The time has come when he who puts his particular institution or his synod first before the Church is unworthy of her. "The Church first" should be our motto. He is not true to our Church who looks at her only through one college or one seminary or one synod or one language or one district. The Church is too large for any one institution, or synod or language or district. Brethren, if this be heresy, I am ready to be tried for it. But I firmly believe and I believe that the great majority in our Church believe with me that the day has come when the narrowness of the past must be lost in the fulness and promise of the future. Shall our Church step forward to place herself among the great Churches of our land. That depends on what this General Synod will do. She will, if she gets the larger vision of the greater things and loses in them her differences. Then like a mighty army she will move on to victory for her Lord.

And this brings me to the third lesson, namely, that of *Church-Progress*. It was a great act of progress when our General Synod was founded 51 years ago. It was a great event of progress when Elector Frederick won his victory at Augsburg, for as a result a large part of Germany became Reformed. And that is the call of the hour to-day—progress. The Church that does not progress regresses. No Church ever

stands still, when she stops she goes back. The Church is like Mr. Spurgeon's comparison of the Christian to the bicycle rider—he must either go on or he will fall off. When the Church lies down, she dies down. Progress is the sign of life. Anything else is the sign of death. Shall our Church progress? That depends on what this General Synod will do. It also depends on the spirit of our people. The Germans have always been conservative and that has been the peculiarity of our Church—conservatism. But I have also noticed that while it takes a good deal to wake up the Germans, when they get wakened up they do great things. Is our Church to waken up, —this sleeping giant, filled with all kinds of strength, financial, moral, spiritual. Like the tale of the fairy, who by her wand woke up the sleeping giant, oh! that a greater than a fairy—the Holy Spirit of the living God—would come and breathe upon us and waken us to the fulfillment of the work God has appointed for us to do in this day and for the future.

And that brings me to the last lesson, with which I briefly close. If we are to have progress, it must be *Spiritual Progress*. The dominant impression at Augsburg that made Frederick so powerful was his spirituality. He looms up there as a spiritual giant. And the Reformed Church has always emphasized spirituality when she was true to herself. Her motto was “spiritual things first.” While other Churches emphasized ritual or organization she emphasized the spiritual. Nothing in her worship was to divert from the spiritual; nothing in her government was to deaden the spiritual. Her motto has always been “spiritual thing first.” Let us in this age keep this clearly in view. In the multitude of our organizations we should keep the spiritual on top. In the richness of our forms we should never allow form to hide the spiritual. Even the moral questions, important as they are, should never be allowed to dwarf the spiritual. For brethren, that is what the world is hungry for, the spiritual. We have had an age of materialistic luxury and the world has by this time become

tired of it. Let us give it the old Reformed spirituality—full of the power and peace of the Holy Spirit. May God help us at this meeting of the General Synod and ever after to build up in this western land a great strong Church, filled with God's Spirit and mightily aiding in conquering this land and all lands for the Cross of our Lord.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

VII.

THE PASTOR AND THE CATECHUMEN.¹

C. E. CREITZ.

The immediate aim of catechization in the Reformed Church in the United States is the preparation of the catechumen by the pastor, for admission into full membership of the Christian Church by the rite of confirmation. This preparation is carried on through a series of weeks or months during which there are regular stated meetings of the pastor and the catechumen, primarily for the study of the catechism. The catechumen may be a child or youth or a mature man or woman. He may be baptized or unbaptized. In the average class of catechumens in our Church a variety of ages and of previous religious training and experience may usually be found. Only in exceptional cases does it seem feasible to divide these into separate groups. While this increases the difficulty of the task, it nevertheless seems unavoidable in most instances.

Since the development of the modern Sunday-school much instruction can be imparted to children and youth that formerly had to be given by the pastor, unless perchance it was furnished by the home. The Sunday-school can teach much of the material that is used in the catechetical class. Indeed in many schools the Heidelberg Catechism is made a supplementary course of instruction. It can inculcate the ethical principles of our holy religion, and provide an outlet in service for the truth which it teaches. But the Sunday-school can never be an adequate substitute for the catechetical class.

¹ An address delivered before the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, at Lancaster, Pa., by the Rev. C. E. Creitz, D.D.

It must always lack that concentration of aim, that definiteness of purpose which is the distinguishing feature of catechetical instruction. The Sunday-school teacher can never take the place of the pastor in the preparation of the young for membership in the Christian Church.

The pastor and the catechumen constitute a relationship that is unique in our religious organization, whose power and influence for good can not be overestimated. The title of this paper is expressed in terms of personality. The pastor and the catechumen are living entities and their relation to one another is vital, not formal or mechanical. Only that which ministers to life, to the enrichment of life, to the development of character, should therefore have a place in the treatment of our subject.

To the end that the pastor may minister in the most effective way to the soul-needs of the catechumen, he must have a certain necessary equipment apart from his character as a Christian man. He must know his catechism, his Bible, and Christian truth in systematic form. He must also know the laws of pedagogy, and above all the catechumen. Three human factors enter into the catechetical process: the catechist, the catechism and the catechumen. As a catechist the pastor becomes a teacher, an educator. As a teacher he must have a thorough knowledge of his material, and as the catechism is his principal text-book, he is under the necessity of knowing this book thoroughly.

The Heidelberg Catechism belongs admittedly to the literature of power as distinguished from the literature of instruction or entertainment, the literature of fancy or imagination. It belongs to that comparatively small class of books that have survived for centuries, not so much for the information that they impart; but because they stimulate the springs of life; because they move the heart and the will. With this book the pastor must be familiar. He must know where its power lies. He must be acquainted with its green pastures and its still waters.

We do no dishonor to the great authors of the catechism and the holy men of old whose labors in the same field contributed so liberally to this classic gem of our denominational literature, when we say that there are desert places in it, dry and rocky heights, and barren wastes, where the average catechumen can find neither clear water nor green grass. Under proper direction, however, the catechism is still a fountain of life and a source of power to multitudes who go to it as a guide into the Christian life. This book the pastor must know.

The Bible, which lies back of the catechism, and which is one of the fountal sources of the spiritual life, the pastor must also know. The most valuable material for the feeding of life and the building of character is found in this book. The public-school teacher may ignore it if he will, the university professor may find in it little to his liking. It has scarcely anything to teach worth knowing about philosophy or music or painting or government or politics or science or the physical universe. But we do not go to Plato or Socrates; to Phidias or Praxiteles; to Thales or Democritus, when we are seeking a guide into the spiritual life, into the Kingdom of God: But we go to Isaiah and Micah; to John and Peter and Paul and above all to Jesus Christ. We do not go to Greece and Rome; but to Palestine for help in the instruction of men in the art of living.

The catechist must also know Christian truth in its relations; that is, he must have a system of theology. He must have a consistent body of doctrine which furnishes a rational explanation of the facts of life and experience. In other words, he must know truth; not simply *a* truth. Teaching only *a* truth makes bigots, zealots, separatists. Teaching truth makes for full-orbed Christians, with broad sympathies and a large outlook. This method makes Christians, not sectarians. It makes for the unity of Christendom; not for its still further division. The catechist in the Reformed Church should have a thorough understanding of the spirit and genius of its theological system as represented in the Heidel-

berg Catechism, which has always been hospitable to truth wherever found and has therefore been a living, growing science instead of a static creed.

But the pastor must not only know his material. He must also know how to use it. He must therefore be a pedagogue, for one of the purposes of the catechetical class is instruction. In the class he is a teacher, and his office as a pastor does not enable him to dispense with the ordinary laws of pedagogy. The teacher in the catechetical class should understand as clearly as any other teacher just what teaching is. Teaching is not only imparting instruction to another; it is not talking to or telling another something that the teacher knows. Teaching when the process is complete means causing another to know. The teacher therefore must understand the laws of the soul, and these laws must be the guide in all true teaching. These laws require that the subject matter be adapted to the capacity of the learner; that the process be from the concrete to the abstract, from "sense to reason," from the known to the unknown. This was the method of Jesus. The Gospels are full of illustrations of this fact. The interview with Nicodemus, the incident at Jacob's well, the story of the Good Samaritan must suffice as examples.

But above all the religious teacher at least must know that there are truths that can only be known by the heart. All knowledge does not come by way of sense perception. We have been taught so long that the only way to get sure knowledge is by the avenue of one of the five senses that we have almost come to believe it. But the senses are only *a* means, not the *only* means to assured knowledge. Our senses can only take us to the outer rim, to the circumference of the material world. They can furnish us with heaps of isolated facts; but they can not give us their causes, their relations, their laws. Without the application of reason there could be no order, no system to our knowledge. While objective facts, therefore, come to us through the senses, we can only understand them by calling in a higher power than sight or feeling. For even

though we say of a thing that it is evident or palpable, when we mean that it is as certain as sight or feeling, it is nevertheless true that without the light of reason facts would remain largely meaningless.

But there lies a realm yet beyond the ken of reason. Into this realm the heart alone has the power to penetrate. It is the region where faith becomes the organ of knowledge. In this region the prophets and seers and poets are supreme. We give all honor to the scientist who unfolds before our eyes the marvelous drama of the evolution of the material universe. So likewise do we honor the philosopher and the logician for the world of rational and orderly truth which they have unrolled to man's mental vision; but we believe that still greater honor and gratitude are due to that noble army of prophets and seers who have revealed to us a world still more wonderful lying beyond the confines of sense and reason—a world of spiritual realities, not less true because it can not be seen with the eye; but must be perceived by the heart. Jesus is the supreme revealer of this world and only those who partake of his nature can see it. The pure in heart shall see God. Without belief in this principle of the soul, no religious teacher can hope to succeed.

Here the Catechism is preëminent. It is a book of the heart. "What is thine only comfort in life and in death?" "That I, with body and soul, both in life and in death, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ." "What is true faith?" "It is not only a certain knowledge. . . but also a hearty trust, which the Holy Ghost works in me by the Gospel." "But why art thou called a Christian?" "Because by faith I am a member of Christ." These great truths are for the heart and can only be apprehended by the heart. They are of the very nature of life, rather than of the nature of intellect or reason.

But the teacher not only needs to know the principles of his art, he must also know its methods. His principles must find application. A method is a principle put into operation. For

the catechist in the Reformed Church, his method is largely determined for him in the very structure of the Heidelberg Catechism itself. This is what is denominated as the Socratic method, or the method of question and answer. Upon the whole this method has not yet been superceded by a better. It can and should be supplemented by other methods, such as the assignment of special topics for more or less exhaustive study, either by analysis or synthesis, by induction or deduction. Room must also be made for the lecture, or a more or less sustained oral explanation of any subject under consideration.

But the question when rightly framed will compel thought on the part of the pupil and will cultivate his power of clear expression. It leads to a consciousness of the possession of knowledge, for when I can express my ideas in lucid language, I know that I know what I know. This method is far better than mere telling, for telling is not necessarily teaching. The right kind of question will always set in motion the currents of thought. It will compel weighing, pondering, deliberating, before an answer is framed. The great Teacher used this method constantly. He is always asking questions. "Whom do men say that I am?" "But whom say ye that I am?" "Whose image and superscription is this?" "How many loaves and fishes have ye?" "Will ye also go away?" "Could ye not watch with me one hour" are specimens taken at random.

The value of drill as a method in education must not be overlooked or neglected. The truths which the catechumen learns are of such supreme value and importance that every possible effort should be made to fix them indelibly in the mind and impress them lastingly upon the heart. "Without repetition," Comenius says, "we do not know solidly." Repetition develops power and permanency.

The pastor must also know the catechumen. Human life is being studied to-day as never before. The proper study of mankind is man, was never truer than just now. All classes of men are students in the school of life. What is life? What is its origin? How does it unfold? How can it be shaped to

particular ends? These questions are asked because it is believed that life is subject to law, and where law reigns certain causes will always produce certain results under the same or similar conditions.

It has been said that the great discovery of the past century has been the child. Before that there were only two factors in education: the teacher and the material. To these has now been added the child, and as no teacher is regarded as fit for his vocation unless he knows the child in his general and in his particular characteristics, so no teacher of religion is qualified to deal with the interests of the soul unless he knows what the soul is. He must know the laws of the soul. He must know that life is constantly changing; that it is a thing that grows; that it passes through certain clearly defined stages from infancy to old age; that each period of life has its own characteristics; that development is gradual, constant, progressive, etc. He must know that the child in the catechetical class is the same being that it is in the public school or in the home. His brain works in the same way. He apprehends truth in the same way. He is influenced and moved by the same forces to the same ends. A knowledge of the human soul in its general laws is therefore an essential equipment of the efficient catechist.

But he should also be thoroughly acquainted with the individual catechumen. While in certain respects all souls are alike; in other respects no two of them are alike. As they differ in outward form and appearance, so they differ in inward temper and constitution. The pastor should know each individual catechumen in his individual needs and characteristics. If such knowledge is regarded as essential to the success of the public school teacher, how much more needful must it be to the spiritual teacher of souls.

But when all has been said about the necessity of the pastor knowing his catechism, his Bible, his theology, his pedagogy, his catechumen, his most important qualification remains yet to be treated. The pastor must above all things be a man of

God, a man of character. "What you are speaks so loud that I can not hear what you say," said Emerson. Of no man is this truer than of the pastor and the catechist. The best that the pastor can give to the catechumen, the best that any man can give to another is himself. If that self is worthy, then the contribution will be worthy. If that self is unworthy then the gift is worthless. Of greater importance than his instruction and the manner of it, is the life of the instructor. We too often assume that knowing a thing is being that thing. We study all sorts of problems in our day and when we know them thoroughly we make ourselves believe that we have done something toward their solution. We study poverty and then delude ourselves with the belief that we have helped the poor. Men study the Bible, and then expect the world to take their knowledge of the Scriptures in lieu of a holy life. The daughter of a physician who died lately, and who was not particularly noted for his piety, sobbed out through her tears, "Father knew a great deal more about the Bible than many people imagined." Henry Ward Beecher said on one occasion that many a woman who prays in the Church on Sunday for patience, does not know that God answered her prayer when He sends her a green Irish maid on Monday. We study the great doctrines of our holy religion and perhaps pray about them and then straightway imagine that we are very good people.

But we have far less confidence in the power of knowledge to make men good than our fathers had. There was a time when "opinions were taken for conscience, and metaphysics for the Gospel." But men are not saved by opinions, nor are they lost by opinions. Experience is driving us back to the method of Jesus. It takes good men to make men good. "Ye are the salt of the earth." "Ye are the light of the world." Life comes only from life. Goodness can not be taught. It must be transmitted, imparted. Truth can rationalize living, but it can not originate life. It can point out the way of life, but it can not give the power to walk therein. It can show the

goal of life; but it can not furnish the motive power to reach it. Men have never been lost so much for lack of knowledge, as for lack of power.

While it is the pastor's duty to give the catechumen a rational understanding of Christian truth, his chief aim should be to bring him to the point where he will be willing and indeed anxious to make a complete surrender of himself to Jesus Christ; where he voluntarily and consciously turns to God in Christ for salvation and eternal life. Only when this point has been reached can the pastor be said to have succeeded. All his instruction must tend toward this end; but that which will most powerfully move the catechumen in this direction will be the pastor himself. The contagious faith and piety and goodness of his own life must get into the life of his catechumens. This was the method of Jesus. He kept a few men in companionship with himself until they became saturated with his life and his spirit and so became centers and sources of life for others. This is the method of winning the world unto himself. Human lives in contagious fellowship with other human lives must finally save the world. Only as good men grow and increase will the Kingdom of God be extended. The Kingdom of God is not a matter of legislation; but a matter of life. It can not be artificially set up; it must grow. And it will grow only as rapidly as one good life will make another life good. Jesus inaugurated this method for the founding of a universal empire, for the ultimate triumph of His Kingdom.

We believe in the educational method of religion. But this is only a method. We do not believe that we can teach men religion. At the most we can only prepare the way for religion. We can only provide that culture of the mind and heart in which the religious life can find a congenial soil in which to spring up and grow. Back of method must be life. Wanting that no method will be adequate. Having that no method can be altogether futile.

We are therefore shut up to the conviction that in our

catechetical work the human factor of supreme importance is the pastor. The highest service, however, which the pastor can render to the catechumen is to lead him into conscious personal fellowship with Jesus Christ. This may occur as "noiselessly as the daylight comes when the night is done." In the young it may be as silent and as free from wrench as the processes of life and growth in the natural world. In those in whom indifference and opposition to God had become a fixed attitude of mind, it may come only after a hard-won struggle with the habits of a life time.

But the pastor's work has only been crowned when the catechumen has found in Jesus his personal Saviour, and when he is ready to dedicate himself to His service forever. In that moment the work of pastor and catechumen finds its supreme consummation, and each is satisfied.

READING, PA.

VIII.

IS THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CHRISTIAN, SPECIFICALLY OF REFORMED CHURCH DOCTRINE, A PRESENT POSSIBILITY?

A. S. ZERBE.

Each age has contributed something to the apprehension of Christian truth. The Church waited four centuries for an Augustine; and fifteen for Luther, Zwingli and Calvin. *Objectively* Christianity is the same in the twentieth century as in the first; but *subjectively* not all its depths have yet been sounded. The Reformers formulated anew the great subjects demanding settlement in their day. Issues of a momentous character have again arisen, which must be met by a legitimate investigation of Christian truth. It is proposed here to inquire whether the progress and discoveries in modern times in all lines of thought and research are of such a revolutionary character that the so-called traditional or Biblical conceptions concerning God, the world, man, sin and redemption (as embodied in the Reformation standards) must be, not merely modified here and there, but abandoned altogether as systems of truth and doctrine and give place to the implications of the current philosophy and theology of evolutionism.

The present demands for a reconstruction of doctrine are of a varied character, but all grow out of the so-called modern world-view, which in turn is based on certain new lines of inquiry. These latter are the new Biblical Criticism, the new physical science, the new psychology, the new ethics, the new sociology and the consequent new philosophy and theology. Everywhere men are clamoring for a new education, a new social order, a new faith, a new Bible, a new Christ, a new God. The old has little worth; men wish to dig underneath

the foundation. In a broad sense all such demands may be reduced to three heads: criticism, science and philosophy.

Old Testament Criticism.—Let us glance at Old Testament Criticism. The legitimacy of an inquiry into the date, authorship and integrity of the books of the Bible has never been questioned, and if such inquiry had always been conducted according to strict literary and historical canons, the dispute as to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament would have been less bitter; but under the guise of literary criticism the Graf-Wellhausen school has persistently injected a purely naturalistic philosophy of history, which leads logically to a denial of miracles and predictive prophecy and in fact of all the distinctive teachings of Scripture. Hence, while new light has been thrown on the Old Testament and the human side minutely described, the divine side has been either neglected or so minimized by the average critic that the Old Testament becomes a merely human book like the Homeric poems.

The impression is sometimes sought to be conveyed that the differences between the old and the new views are easily reconcilable. But Professor Jordan, reviewing G. A. Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, writes: "It is no use attempting to minimize the difference between the traditional view and the critical treatment of the Old Testament. The difference is immense; they involve different conceptions of the relation of God to the world; different views as to the course of Israel's history, the process of revelation, and the nature of inspiration. We cannot be lifted from the old to the new position by the influence of a charming literary style or by the force of the most enthusiastic eloquence."¹ Rev. I. Gibson in a work championing Grafianism, says: "The traditional and critical views of revelation are face to face in open antagonism." Dr. Hazard in the introduction to Gibson's book regards these theories as mutually destructive. Dr. Volck, of Dorpat, a conservative, writes: "Under

¹ *Am. Jour. Theol.*, 1902, p. 114.

the influence of Wellhausen the opposition to the churchly conception of the Old Testament has developed to the utmost extreme. Peace between the two camps is impossible; the gulf which separates them cannot be bridged.”²

This open antagonism is due to the underlying naturalistic monism of the Graf-Wellhausen school, according to which all religion is of human origin, “a development of the human spirit” (Vatke), and all history a progressive development in a straight, upward line—an hypothesis which overlooks the fact that in history we must take account of the will and motives of men (to say nothing of the Supreme Personality, God). Society is not a biological organism, but an organization in which the personal element is ever active. Nor is the hypothesis of a uniform advance in civilization and religion verified by the history of any ancient people. Otto Weber writes: “The dogma of a gradual development from a lower to a higher level is not sustained by the history of any Oriental peoples. History leaves upon us, on the contrary, the impression of decadence rather than of advancing civilization, which tries to find fixed forms; everywhere in art, science and religion, this is confirmed.”³

Every competent scholar welcomes historical investigation provided it is not cast in the Procrustean bed of a pre-conceived anti-Biblical philosophy. When the historian undertakes to explain away the miracles of the Old Testament or the possibility of a special revelation he enters the field of metaphysics and so is tempted to settle the case in advance. This is precisely the present state of the question regarding the origin and development of the Old Testament religion. The Graf-Wellhausen critics, to be sure, never cease to speak of the grand ideals and sentiments of the Hebrew sages, but none the less the Old Testament is for them a purely human product. Recognizing, of course, the marked progress during the last half-century in all lines of Old Testament inquiry

² *Heil. Schrift u. Kritik*, p. 190.

³ *Theologie u. Assyriologie*.

and the consequent need of various modifications in traditional views, we at the same time interpret the philosophic viewpoint (which is after all the fundamental issue) of the dominant Old Testament criticism to be a thinly veiled naturalistic evolutionism, that is, in the language of Kuenen "the Old Testament religion, though of a high order, does not differ fundamentally from other religions," or in the language of a more recent authority, the idea of a supernatural element "contradicts the laws of the spiritual development of mankind."⁴ With all its achievements the current Old Testament criticism and theology (or rather its No-Theology, swamped by a one-sided *religionsgeschichtliche* method and postulate) is not final or even consistent in any such sense as to require a radical and revolutionary reformulation of Old Testament doctrine.

New Testament Criticism.—A similar judgment must be pronounced, *mutatis mutandis*, on the whole trend and present state of negative New Testament criticism. Volumes upon volumes have appeared in the last fifty years on the origin and character of the New Testament. In the field of textual, literary and historical criticism great progress has been made, valuable data collected and the minutest questions of text, authorship, integrity and spiritual significance investigated by scholars of the first rank and of every shade of belief. While there has been a steady stream of destructive criticism, threatening at times to sweep away the major part of the New Testament, there has been also constructive criticism. The traditional date, character and setting of some of the books may need to be modified, but it cannot be said that a sane New Testament criticism demands an essential re-formulation of the New Testament as a whole. It is still from a textual, literary and historical view-point, the New Testament of the early Christian centuries. When therefore men speak of a new Bible we understand them to refer at most to an improved, but not a radically new text. So far then as literary-

⁴ Stade, *Bib. Theologie d. A.T.*

historical criticism of Scripture goes, there is no absolute need for a reconstruction of Christian doctrine.

The Person of Christ.—But it is said that the new and original conception of the person of Christ and his atoning work necessitates a reformulation, if not a reconstruction of Christian doctrine. It is indeed recognized on all sides that a thorough discussion of the doctrine of the person of Christ in the light of modern research (especially in psychology and ethics, as well as metaphysics) is an imperative need of the age—a discussion, however, which will embrace every element of the problem and every school of thought from the earliest or Nicene formula to the latest German treatise. After the Church had during all the Christian centuries accepted the divine-human person of Christ as formulated in the Creed of Chalcedon, the last half century has been characterized by a persistent attempt to interpret the person of Christ in terms of humanity. All sorts of hypotheses have been advanced, from the one-sidedly radical to the one-sidedly conservative, as the Christ of rationalism, of liberalism, of mythology, of the pragmatic and functional psychology and even of sociology and socialism. Unfortunately, the critics of the traditional Church doctrine have nowhere either in any Ecumenical Council, or General Synod or any authoritative treatise formulated their position, possibly for the sufficient reason that the “new” views are too vague to admit of definite formulation. But the issue is narrowed to the question whether according to the Heidelberg Catechism Jesus is both very God and very man, or merely a finite being, a being to be sure of exalted rank and endowment, but nevertheless a finite being.

After Pfleiderer, Bossuet, Drews, Neumann, Schmiedel, Wellhausen, Jensen and negative critics generally have finished their analysis, we have an emasculated Jesus, who is neither true God nor true man, but a fiction of modern speculation. Yet despite the failure of the long-continued attempt to eliminate the supernatural from the conception of Jesus, the whole course of contemporaneous criticism has ended in a

negative vindication of the deity of Christ. To-day it is possible on the testimony of the negative critics themselves to vindicate the character of Jesus as holy and sinless; to assert the perfection of his moral teaching and to base Christianity on the ineffable divine-human character of our Lord Jesus Christ. In other words, criticism after rejecting the Christ of Scripture must in the end restore Him in order to account for the facts of history and his wonderful life and character.

Physical Science in General.—We turn now to the claim that the discoveries in science demand a radical reconstruction of Christian doctrine in terms, not of Biblical theism, but of the modern doctrine of evolution. According to the new physics the reign of natural law is universal in the realms of matter and mind; the universe did not originate in time, but is evolved from eternity by some latent force or energy. The mineral, the plant, the animal, man and even God (if there be a God, for in the pragmatic philosophy God comes under the category of becoming) are but successive stages in the never-ceasing materialistico-energetic movement. The issue between the old and the new theology starts with the first chapter of Genesis, which predicates a personal God as the Creator of the universe. According to Scripture, the creation, though ideally present in the divine plan from eternity, was an event in time (was the beginning of time), not a necessitated process from eternity. God would be God, even if He had not created, for we must assume in the persons of the God-head a perfect eternal self-contemplation apart from and before creation; otherwise we are forced into a pantheistic identification of God and the universe. Eucken states the problem: "The direct denial of a personality of God aims at a denial of a superiority over against the world-process, aims at bringing about a pantheistic melting of the Absolute Life in the world."⁵ Henri Bergson, the French philosophic wizard, says that all the so-called creations of man "are only creations of *form*. How could they be anything else? . . . To

⁵ *Wahrheit der Religion*.

speaking of things creating themselves would therefore amount to saying that the understanding presents to itself more than it presents to itself—a self-contradictory affirmation, an empty and vain idea.”⁶ Nor can the “laws of nature,” about which we hear so much, produce anything absolutely new; they are only generalizations of our ideas of things and imply a lawgiver.

The Genesis account teaches both creation and development. God is the Great First Cause, but He has ordained second causes, or forces of nature, as seen in the expressions, “let the waters, the earth, etc., bring forth.” The earth and the elements perform their part, but God is back of all. Science cannot explain how the change from the chaotic was effected, but Scripture says it was through the Spirit of God, who is the quickening principle in the world.

What, now, over against the Biblical account are the teachings of astronomy, paleontology, geology, physics, chemistry, biology and physical science generally? On the origin of the universe of matter, scientists vacillate between three hypotheses, the Nebular, the Meteoritic, and the Planetesimal. The nebular hypothesis of Laplace, formerly almost universally accepted by scientists, is now practically abandoned; the meteoritic, defended by Sir Norman Lockyer (according to whom the nebulae, instead of being intensely heated gas, are swarms of solid meteorites which were originally cold but are heated by collisions), is too improbable in its workings and too full of contingencies to be accepted; the planetesimal, originated by Professor Chamberlin, of Chicago, and differing in many ways from the two preceding, among others that the planets were all formed at the same time, is still in the experimental stage, though gaining in scientific favor (see Chamberlin’s larger, or smaller work on Geology). “The fact that at the beginning of Palaeozoic times, places on the earth had a colder climate than they have to-day agrees better

⁶ *L’Evolution Creatrice.*

with the planetesimal than with the incandescent nebular theory."⁷

There is, however, no consensus of opinion on the subject. "Up to the present time no definite light has been thrown by physics on the origin and earliest condition of the globe."⁸ "So imperfect is our knowledge of the facts that even in advanced works, only a general idea of the conditions of past times can be given."⁹ Alfred Russell Wallace wrote in his last work: "The abrupt changes in the life-forms and the world-wide unconformity on passing from one division to the other, are as great as ever." Wallace admits that the geological record is very incomplete and that it "only carries us back to somewhere about the middle of the whole period during which life has existed upon the earth." To the same effect Professor Alexander: "From the very nature of its origin, the record is necessarily fragmentary and it has been further mutilated and obscured by the revolutions of successive ages."

Professor Osborne, Columbia University, points out that the researches in paleontology are equally unsatisfactory: "The net result of observation is not favorable to the essentially Darwinian view that the adaptive arises out of the fortuitous by selection, but is rather favorable to the hypothesis of the existence of some quite unknown intrinsic law of life which we are at present totally unable to comprehend or conceive. . . . The only inkling of possible underlying principles in this orderly process is that there appears to be in respect to certain characters a potentiality or a predisposition through hereditary kinship to evolve in certain definite directions."¹⁰ Osborne in skillfully straddling between rival theories leaves us little comfort, but allows that the whole field teems with controversy not merely as to the significance of facts, but as to the facts themselves.

Chemistry and biology throw little light on the combination

⁷ J. W. Gregory, professor of geology, Glasgow Univ., in *The Making of the Earth*, 1912.

⁸ Prof. Arch. Alexander in *Eleventh Ed. Ency. Brit.*

⁹ J. E. Marr, professor in Cam. Univ., in *Introduction to Geology*, 1911.

¹⁰ *Ency. Brit.* eleventh ed.

of substances and the origin of life. Science cannot tell what life is or whence it came. There is no basis of agreement among biologists, though an endless variety of hypotheses. What atoms, molecules, ions, electrons, ether, gravitation, the *elan vitale* are, and whence they came is almost as much a mystery to science as ever. Nearly every scientific book that one opens holds that all that is known of the universe is comprehended under the three heads of matter, ether, energy. And yet matter has disappeared as a fundamental existence, ether (visible only to mind) is neither matter nor energy (unless, as Mendeleeff holds, it be the lightest and simplest of the elements) and energy is an immaterial, mysterious something (sometimes by courtesy written Energy). In a recent book on science we are told: "The great law of continuity forbids us to assume that life suddenly appeared out of nothing and tells us that we must look for the element of life in the very *elements of matter*, for the potentiality of life should exist in every atom."¹¹ With most physicists this "potentiality" would seem to be both "*potentia*" and "*actus*."

Evolution.—Everywhere today men conjure with the magic word evolution. We read of the evolution of the steam-engine and the automobile, the evolution of literature and civil government, of a nation and of religion, the evolution of a butterfly from a caterpillar, the evolution of a lady's bonnet and the evolution of the universe and so on indefinitely. In most cases the word means simply change, advance, progress, development. There are so many meanings that in popular speech and in some scientific works the term is entirely colorless and may mean anything or nothing.

But back of this confusion of speech is a confusion of thought. Since there is no generally accepted definition there can be no well-defined use of the word. Hence if one is unable to explain a fact of history, science or religion, he may hide his ignorance behind this ever serviceable word. If you do not know why the giraffe came to have a long neck, or how

¹¹ R. K. Duncan, *The New Knowledge*, 1910.

the modern horse with one toe came to descend from the ancient horse with four toes, or why Moses promulgated the Ten Words, simply say that it is an evolution and you will be regarded as a wise man and profound thinker. That there is such a thing as evolution in the modern (and not merely in the Aristotelian) sense and that we may distinguish between development as denoting the processes of the individual's history from the beginning of its existence to its death, and evolution as denoting racial descent, we freely grant. Our contention here is that scientists leave so many things unexplained in the method and processes of evolution and put forth so many assumptions that we cannot always be certain of the facts (there being such marked and fundamental discrepancies among scientists themselves); in short they have not solved the old problem of being and becoming, of heredity and environment, of creation in the Biblical sense and creation in the scientific sense. In fact they have unsettled as many questions as they have settled.

If ever there was a warfare it is that being waged this very hour between the rival schools of evolution—a warfare so destructive that the world is asking which party is right, or whether all are not defending half-baked hypotheses. Thus we have the two chief schools or camps known as Vitalism and Mechanism, the former predicating a subtle immaterial agency endowed with reason and directing the activity of each being, a kind of mind stuff; the latter affirming that all change, development, evolution in the animate and inanimate world are due to physical and chemical agencies. The antithesis is irreconcilable, for the chasm between the organic and the inorganic, between mere force and life, has never been bridged (the exceptions announced from time to time are purely sporadic). Millions of atoms of star-dust could never originate the tiniest blade of grass. To add to our perplexity both the vitalistic and the mechanistic schools are split into groups.

Here are the Neo-Lamarckians who make evolution hinge on environmental factors; there the ultra-Darwinians who

proclaim the all-sufficiency of natural selection. Yonder are the two camps of heterogenesis and orthogenesis, the former regarding "discontinuous variations as the material of organic evolution," the latter assuming a determinate progressive movement in the organic world as "an intrinsic part of its organization." Heterogenesis emphasizes single variations; orthogenesis, "an inherent growth of the organism." These are mutually exclusive hypotheses. Even the doctrine of descent cannot be satisfactorily formulated. "To one party it is a proved fact, to another a probable, scientific working hypothesis, to a third a 'rescuing plank.' One party is always finding fresh corroborations, another new difficulties. And within the same group we find the contrasts of believers in monophyletic and believers in polyphyletic evolution, the mechanists and the half-confessed or thoroughgoing vitalists, the preformationists and the believers in epigenesis. . . . The all-sufficiency of natural selection is proclaimed by some, its impotence by others."¹²

Differing in their fundamental concepts, scientific authorities differ radically in their formulation of the doctrine of evolution. President Schurman of Cornell University declares: "The *survival* of the fittest does not explain the *arrival* of the fittest." On the other hand, Prof. J. M. Baldwin writes in a recent work: "I think therefore the conclusion on page 87 to the effect that natural selection [as Darwin conceived it] is in principle the natural law of genetic organization and progress in nature—human nature no less than physical nature—is that to which the lines of evidence we have distinctly point"¹³—a conclusion not shared by the great body of German scientists. "Natural selection without teleological factors is not adequate to account for biological evolution and such factors imply a psychical something endowed with feeling and will, *i. e.*, life and mind."¹⁴

In short, leading German and English scientists admit that

¹² R. Otto, *Naturalistische u. Religioese Weltansicht*.

¹³ *Library of Genetic Science*, Vol. II.

¹⁴ James Ward.

the current definitions and claims of evolution are vague and unsatisfactory in the extreme. Thus Wigand, author of various scientific works, writes: "Evolution is an indefinite and confused movement of the mind of the age."¹⁵ Dr. W. Kidd declares: "It is the nebulous character of the doctrine of evolution that constitutes its strength."

Every one who has followed the trend of European thought is aware that evolutionists are less vociferous in their claims than a decade ago. The idea of a steady forward and upward movement in evolution has recently been rudely shaken. Thus Prof. L. T. Hobhouse, University of London, writes in a work just from the press: "The appearance of an upward process in evolution then was illusory. It was due to the human observer, who could not see clearly beyond the segment of the whole curve on which he himself happened to be placed."¹⁶ Then, too, Hans Dreisch, author of a dozen scientific works, exhaustively discussing biological evolution, comes out boldly as follows: "So it follows that almost everything has still to be done; for no hypothesis at present accounts for the foundation of all systematics, viz. for the differences in organization, in all that relates to the so-called types as such and the degrees of complication in these types, both of which are independent of histological adaptation and adaptedness. What do we know about anything that might be said to bear on the problem? What we know actually about any derivation of inheritance proper, that is about congenital differences between parents and the offspring, *is practically nothing* [Italics those of the author]; indeed there are at our disposal only the few facts observed by de Vries or derived from the experience of horticulturists or breeders. These facts prove at least the possibility of discontinuous variation, that is of mutation leading to constant results; but everything else, that is everything about a real theory of phylogeny, must be left to the taste of each author who writes on the theory of the Living.

¹⁵ *Darwinismus*, etc.

¹⁶ *Development and Purpose*, 1913.

You may call this a very unscientific state of affairs, but no other is possible. And in fact it has been admitted by almost all who have dealt with transformation without prepossession. . . . And it is well known that hypothetical statements about an original law of phylogeny have been attempted by Naegeli, Koelliker, Wigand, Eimer and others. But a full discussion of all these 'laws' would hardly help us much in our theoretical endeavor, as all of them, it must be confessed, do little more than state the mere fact that some unknown principle of organization must have been at work in phylogeny, if we are to accept the theory of descent at all."¹⁷

Such are the admissions of high European authorities. And yet no sooner does the enterprising graduate of an American State college discover some new variety of bug or beetle than he is tempted forthwith to propound a new theory of the universe and declare all former views obsolete. If he is unusually "fresh" he may suggest the formation of an infidel club with the motto "Down with the Bible, Up with Science."

The commonly accepted dictum of science, that man has of course descended from the animal, zealously advertised by the average magazine writer and preacher, and the "progressive" theological professor, has received some severe jolts recently from the scientific side. "If we take specially favored races and epochs of the past for comparison, there is not the slightest proof of any advance in average human faculty. True, social progress does not necessarily require any improvement in the congenital qualities of individuals, and the question should be rather whether the collective achievement of mankind grows—in knowledge, ethics, religion, social organization. But on all these points, with the exception of knowledge and its direct approach to industry, scepticism is abundantly possible and it is easy to assert that there have been earlier epochs when religion was purer, social life better organized, men and women on the whole happier, and industry devoted to the production of more beautiful objects than skyscrapers, factory-

¹⁷ *The Science and Philosophy of the Organism*, Gifford Lectures, 1907.

chimneys, gigantic hoardings and aniline dyes. I was never one of those who think that the general fact of progress may be readily assumed or that mankind constantly advances to higher things by an automatic law which can be left to itself. On the contrary I believe that there was no upward tendency in things as such."¹⁸

Human history, according to Dreisch, is not a true evolution, but more properly a series of *cumulations*, as seen, *e. g.*, in the various economic systems. Nor is man an evolution of the animal: "There is nothing evolutionary relative to the generation of mankind as such, at least nothing is proved about such evolution. You may call my view pessimistic, but be it pessimistic or not, we are here moving on scientific ground only and have merely to study the probability or improbability of problematic facts, and with such a view in our mind, we are bound to say that a true logical and moral evolution of mankind is not supported by known facts. There is a process of logical and moral perfection, but this process *is not one*, is not simple in its activity; it is not connected with the one and single line of history, but only with a few generations each time it occurs or even with one individual, at least ideally. And this process is not less a process of cumulation than any other sort of development or so called 'progress' in history is."¹⁹

Dreisch's summary is so *a propos* to the question before us that we are warranted in reproducing it as proof that scientists of the first rank have no clear-cut theory of evolution: "We have finished our analysis of the history of mankind as the only instance of an historical *biological* process that is actually known to exist and is not only assumed hypothetically. What we have learned from this analysis, though certainly important in itself, has not afforded us any new result for theoretical biology. To sum up: we expected that a rational system might be a biological result of the future, but we could not

¹⁸ Prof. Hobhouse, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*

claim at all to possess such a system. We said that transformation might be proved one day to be a true evolution, governed by one immanent principle, which then would have to be regarded as a new primary fact in nature, but we did not know the least about that principle. Human history on the other hand—that is the only historical process concerned with life that is actually known to have occurred—could not teach us anything of an elemental character, since human history at present at least did not appear to us a true evolution, but only as a sum of accumulations, and the singularities of this history, taken by themselves, could only be of practical or emotional interest.”

Such, too, is the attitude of the great French scientist, H. Poincaré: “Some scientists, as Mon. Le Roy admit that science consists only of conventions and to this circumstance solely does it owe its apparent certitude: the facts of science and *a fortiori* its laws are the artificial work of the scientist; science, therefore, can teach us nothing of the truth; it can serve only as a rule of action.” After remarking that no particular (scientific) law will ever be more than approximate and probable, Poincaré proceeds: “When therefore a scientific theory pretends to teach us what heat is, or what is electricity, or light, it is condemned beforehand; all it can give us is a crude image. It is therefore provisional and crumbling. . . . Today the theories are born, to-morrow they are the fashion, the day after to-morrow they are classic, the fourth day they are superannuated and the fifth day they are forgotten.”²⁰

Theistic and Anti-Theistic Evolutionists.—Evolutionists may also be classified as theistic and anti-theistic. Theistic evolutionists are not very successful in explaining what they mean. They employ such phrases as “creation by evolution,” and “creative evolution,” which are really contradictory expressions. Le Conte advocating a *quasi* theistic theory says: “Man is something more than a higher species of animal....

²⁰ *The Value of Science*, 1907.

His spirit is a spark of divine energy individuated to the point of self-consciousness and recognition of his relation to God." But Le Conte also writes: "Beings are continually modified into different beings, *i. e.*, undergoing evolution, which is a law of continuity, a universal law of being." The implication is that all things were made, not through the Logos, but by some "law of becoming."

The anti-theistic evolutionists tell us frankly that their theory implies a naturalistic philosophy pure and simple. So Huxley: "The hypothesis of evolution supposes that in all this vast progression there would be no breach of continuity, no point at which we could say 'This is a natural process' and 'This is not a natural process.'" Prof. E. D. Cope, a high American authority, writes: "The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been and is accomplished by the agency of the energies which are intrinsic in the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies which are external to it. . . . The science of evolution is the science of creation." "By whatever method species of plants or animals came into existence, they may be rightly said to be created. We speak of the existing plants and animals as having been created, although we know them to have been evolved from seeds, eggs and other germs—and indeed from those excessively minute and simple structures known as cells."²¹

These bold avowals clearly define the issue. All takes place by virtue of forces resident in matter. God is not back of the process either in the initial or subsequent stages. This world-view passes under various names, old and new, such as pantheism, materialism, naturalism, and energetic monism, each of which expresses some phase of the hypothesis, but since some impersonal force or energy is alleged to be back of all things the phrase *energetic monism* (having the sanction of German writers) is here regarded as most expressive. But by

²¹ Prof. J. W. Judd, Cambridge, Eng., in *The Coming of Evolution*, 1910.

whatever name designated, the idea is that matter, force, plants, animals, man, God (if there be one) are fundamentally one. The opposite or theistic view is that God originated the realms of matter-force, life and soul-spirit. The two theories are diametrically opposed, there being no middle ground. Haeckel claims to have destroyed three central doctrines of the Christian religion, namely the existence of a Supreme Being, the personality of man (as usually understood) and the immortality of the soul. If his premises (and those of many scientists) are correct, the conclusions are legitimate. It is against this naturalistic theory of the universe that we protest.

In brief, our examination of the latest scientific authorities is not re-assuring as to definite results. Du Bois Raymond said that no one has ever seen evolution, and indeed from the nature of the case cannot see it. It is less a scientifically established fact than a philosophic speculation. The evolutionists can say with the pragmatists and functional psychologists: "We do not know where we are going, but we are on the way." Until, therefore, the scientists reach their destination and settle their family quarrel and so come forward with a consistent and generally accepted theory of the origin and development of the universe, we may decline with thanks their gratuitous offer to adjudicate theological controversies.^{21a}

^{21a} As the proof-sheets of the above are being read there comes to hand the presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Melbourne, Australia, on "*Heredity. New Theories and Facts Relating to the History of Organic Beings*," by Prof. W. Bateson, Director of the John Innes Horticultural Institution, who advances the hypothesis that the development of life may not have proceeded from the simple to the complex, as Herbert Spencer and others have taught, but rather from the complex to the simple, in short, that the earliest and simplest forms of life may have contained in some mysterious way all the peculiarities of the latter complex forms. We quote from the address in the *Scientific American Supplement*. "We read his [Darwin's] scheme of evolution as we would those of Lucretius or of Lamarck." "The doctrine of the survival of the fittest . . . is mere eighteenth century optimism." "It was a commonplace of evolutionary theory that at least the domestic animals have been developed from a few wild types. . . . The

Taking their cue from physical science, nearly all other sciences to-day are reconstructed along evolutionistic and naturalistic lines, as psychology, ethics, sociology and pedagogy.

The New Psychology.—Of special significance is the New Psychology, or psychology without the “psyche,” which, adopting the evolutionistic formula, teaches that the soul is not an abiding entity, but a mere stream of consciousness, a series of passing states. This theory of Actualism or Phenomenalism is held by men of such diverse schools as Spinoza, Hume, Darwin, Spencer, Karl Vogt, Buechner, Haeckel, Wundt, James and Muensterberg. On the other hand is the traditional school of Substantialism, Spiritualism or personal Idealism, according to which the person is an abiding self, essentially though not empirically the same from day to day. The view that the soul is a substantial entity of some kind has the support of Plato, Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, Lotze, Ulrizi, Stoudt, Royce. But at present the trend is toward Actualism, and probably the majority of American psychologists would agree with Professor James when he writes: “I feel entirely free to discard the word soul from the rest of this book. If I ever use it, it will be in the vaguest and most popular way.”²² The soul is only “a stream of thought,” “thought itself is the only verifiable thinker.”²³ He does not explain how there can be various races of birds, for instance, all came from the Indian jungle fowl. . . . But try to reconstruct the steps in their evolution and you realize your hopeless ignorance.” “New species may be now in course of creation, but the limits of the process are obviously narrow. On the other hand we see no changes in progress around us in the contemporary world which we can imagine likely to culminate in the evolution of forms distinct in the larger sense. By intercrossing dogs, jackals and wolves new forms of these types can be made, some of which may be species, but I see no reason to think that from such material a fox could be bred in an indefinite time or that dogs could be bred from foxes.” “The outcome, as you will see, is negative, *destroying much that till lately passed for Gospel*. . . . We are just about where Boyle was in the seventeenth century. We can dispose of alchemy, but we can not make more than a quasi-chemistry. We are awaiting our Priestley and Mendeleeff.” Again we ask, *What is Evolution?*

²² *Principles of Psychology*, I, p. 350.

²³ P. 346.

thought without a thinker. Inconsistently enough, he allows that Spiritualism is the only escape from the untenable mind-stuff hypothesis and materialism, and is the indispensable basis for any doctrine of the soul's immortality.²⁴ Some years ago students at Harvard could listen to an eloquent lecture by Professor James on Actualism and the Pragmatic Philosophy, and then on the same day in the same building listen to an equally persuasive defence of Substantialism and personal Idealism by Professor Royce. When such high authorities differ fundamentally, what shall we think of the boastful claim that contemporary psychology supplies the key to the mystery of personality? Again we ask, Shall the Church submit the great questions pertaining to the soul to a body of men who are about equally divided as to the corner-stone of their science, who in fact cannot assure us whether or not there be a soul?

The same uncertainty prevails in the greatly overrated psychology of religion, which undertakes to analyze the religious life by what James called the nuisance of the questionnaire method. In the hands of such functional psychologists as Starbuck, Ames and Leuba, regeneration and conversion are not due to a profound change of heart through the Spirit of God, but are merely psychical phenomena of the adolescent state, or the outcome of unusual excitement. Some writers, as Ames, do not hesitate to affirm that religion originates in the social consciousness rather than in a feeling of dependence on a Higher Power or God. Verily, unless the psychologists of religion can offer us something more satisfactory than what we find in the common type of exponents, we must object to have Christian doctrine reconstructed along any such lines.

A similar conclusion must be formed regarding the prevailing type of works on comparative religion and the philosophy of religion.

Philosophy.—As a result of these scientific and psychological investigations there has arisen a new world-view or philosophy, or rather an old philosophy in a new setting,

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 343.

under various names, such as the new Humanism, Pragmatism, Evolutionism, energetic (scientific) monism and idealistic pantheism. All these later philosophies, in varying degree, but with substantially the same conception, are drifting toward *naturalism*, the theory "which excludes everything distinctly spiritual or transcendental" in contrast with *supernaturalism*, "the doctrine that the world, including man, is to be referred in the last analysis to a being who in his nature and power transcends the world and cannot be identified with its force and operations."²⁵

Fundamentally all world-views are reducible to two: *Personalism* and *Impersonalism*. According to Personalism or spiritual Idealism, consciousness is not merely a collection of ideas, but implies a conscious self, an abiding entity, that is, a unique reality which is the ground and source of ideas. Descartes, Kant, Lotze, Fichte, Hegel and Royce so hold. This school, however, splits up into pluralistic personal idealists and monistic personal idealists, the former holding that ultimate reality consists in the community of all related selves or spirits; the latter, that ultimate reality is in its inmost nature a single person, essentially the God of the Bible. According to Impersonalism there is no Absolute Being, no personal God in the universe, but merely an omnipresent something variously designated as force, will, mind, energy, *elan vitale* (Bergson) or plastic power of an unknown character. Here are found the materialists and idealistic pantheists of all shades. The controlling principle of this latter school is that the universe is an evolution of one intelligent, but impersonal force, agent or energy, though they do not explain how there can be immanent design (which is allowed) without a designer.

Lately this new pantheism under the name of monism (that is, energetic or impersonal in contrast with spiritual or personal monism) has become a scientific and philosophic fad in some circles and is hailed as the key to all knowledge and religion. Thus Ex-President Eliot in his *Religion of the*

²⁵ Baldwin, *Dic. of Psy. and Phil.*

Future, writes: "The scientific doctrine of one omnipresent, eternal Energy is fundamentally and completely inconsistent with the dualistic conception which sets spirit over against matter, good over against evil, man's wickedness against God's righteousness and Satan against Christ." The student of philosophy is astounded at this bold identity-hypothesis of spirit and matter, good and evil, Christ and Satan. Not even the arch-pantheist Spinoza obliterated the distinction between matter and mind, good and evil. We have here a pantheism which is virtually atheism, for Eliot's impersonal spirit is only a blind force.

It is to be regretted that some ministers and college professors who have not looked sharply into recent philosophy incline toward this new pantheism, which in some respects is more objectionable than the old. Professor G. T. Ladd of Yale states the correct view: "There are two fundamental and irremovable distinctions, the distinction between matter and mind, and the distinction between moral good and evil, the denial or insufficient explanation of which by speculative systems furnishes and relatively justifies the recurrent protest of dualism."

It is an encouraging sign of the times that in English and German philosophical circles there is a strong undercurrent toward Personalism or monistic personal Idealism, and this, too, in spite of the tendency in scientific circles toward some form of Impersanologism. Here, again, our conclusion is that as long as men are entangled in the meshes of a false philosophy it is a waste of time to undertake any reconstruction of doctrine.

The New Theology.—The new philosophy issues in a new theology; and the newest new theology boldly proclaims the identity of spirit and matter, God and man. One of its defenders writes: "The foundation truth of the new theology is the fundamental unity of God and man."²⁶ We are told that "strictly speaking, the human and the divine are two cate-

²⁶ R. J. Campbell, in *The New Theology*.

gories which shade into and imply each other; humanity is divinity viewed from *below*, divinity is humanity viewed from *above*." This is not the time-honored view that God seeks man and man seeks God, but is intended to express the metaphysical oneness of God and man. The concrete application is that man is not a sinner, a fallen being, but a creature of exalted rank, a species of demi-god, capable by a truly evolutionary process of working out his own salvation and so needing no Savior, atonement or Bible. The mere statement of these propositions is sufficient to indicate their revolutionary character.

This is of course the old question of the relation of God to the world. The old theology tended to separate God too widely from the world; the new identifies them too closely. In the new theology God is swallowed up in the world and denied a true personality. Scripture clearly teaches both the divine immanence and the divine transcendence and supplies the key to a true monotheism. Christian theism emphasizes the thought that God is operative in nature not only as the Great First Cause, but also through secondary causes. This truth is sometimes exaggerated to the extreme of confusing immanence and identity. Heat may permeate iron but it is not identical with it. God is immanent in the world without being identical with it. Here the Scripture doctrine of the personality of God comes to our relief. The assertion of immanence without transcendence leads to pantheism, and with pantheism, old or new, Christianity can make no truce. God is infinite, we are finite; He inhabiteth eternity, we are the creatures of a day; He is holy, we are sinful.

As long, therefore, as men, confounding the metaphysical and the ethical, teach that God and man are fundamentally (metaphysically) one, there can be no peace in the theological camp and no common basis for the reconstruction of doctrine.

Another aberration of modern thought is the blending of the natural and the supernatural. Eliot writes: "The religion of the future will have in it nothing of the supernatural."

Here we have the whole new theology in a nutshell. Everything is reduced to one dead level of natural causation, with no Supreme Being to originate the laws or direct the movement to a definite goal. All is a fortuitous play of force and atoms. Eliot further affirms: "If God is thoroughly immanent in the entire creation, there can be no secondary causes in either the natural or the spiritual universe." If there are no secondary causes man is a mere machine. The denial of secondary causes is characteristic of the new pantheism or monism, despite the fact that man is clearly capable of initiating a new line of action. If man is a free moral agent, certainly God must be. If Eliot conceded secondary causes he would be forced to allow that God works both mediately and immediately. The God of the Ex-President of Harvard is a mere Energy, a "finite" God, who never intervenes in the world-history, but has been politely "escorted to the frontiers of the universe."

Another strange confusion of modern "thought" is the hypothesis that man by nature is a "potential Christ," which is a logical outcome of a false immanence. Recently a minister was guilty of the shocking assertion that a man who had spent the preceding night in a drunken carousal was seeking Christ, only he had not chosen the best way. Here sin is so minimized as to vanish, or rather to become the germ of holiness. And such blasphemy passes for profundity of thought!! As long as Rom. 3: 10-18 remains a faithful portraiture of man's real nature, this whole conception of a potential or immanent Christ is a lamentable perversion of the truth. It would be equally correct to say that man has in him a potential Satan, and unless regenerated by the Spirit of God will end in a Satanic permanence of character.

Over against all such vagaries we place the very latest deliverance from a high English authority, Dr. James Ward, professor of mental philosophy in Cambridge and author of the classic work on *Naturalism and Agnosticism*: "As to God we can only regard Him as Spirit, as possessing intelligence and will, and so as personal. . . . How God created the world,

how the One is the ground of the many, we admit we cannot tell. . . . While we have to maintain that in determining the world—his world—God also determines himself, it would be absurd to suppose that in thus determining himself he, so to say, diminishes himself. . . . God does not transform, differentiate or fractionate himself into the world, and so cease to be God. Such theism would only be pantheism, which is truly but atheism. But now, finally, if the world, though God's world, the expression and revelation of himself, is yet not God, if though he is immanent in it, he is also as its creator transcendent to it, surely the greater the world—the greater the freedom and capacity of his creatures—the greater still is he who created and sustains and somehow surely overrules it all.”²⁷

Such a theism, accepted by the foremost thinkers of the day, involves implicitly the essential postulates of the traditional theology—the transcendence of God, man's true personality and accountability, creation, providence, and in short the mutual relation of God and man.

Conceding all due credit for the industry displayed by the advocates of the new theology in applying the naturalistic teachings of the New Biblical criticism, the new science, the new psychology, the new philosophy, the new psychology of religion, the new comparative religion and the new philosophy of religion to the underlying problems of theology, we are able to discover only a little that is truly “new” and that little largely in a false setting. Our resume has shown that the new science and philosophy, as they stand today, are too vague, indefinite and contradictory to afford a satisfactory basis for a radical reconstruction of Christian doctrine; and since most of the recent ultra works on Christian doctrine rarely appeal to the Bible at all, and then only in terms of the modern “mind,” any contemplated reconstructive movement stands or falls with contemporaneous science and philosophy.

Allowing, however, that Christian scholars today have a

²⁷ *The Realm of Ends*, etc., p. 443, 1911.

broader view of the teachings of Scripture and indeed of science and philosophy than in some former periods, and holding further that our apprehension of the truth differs from age to age and is, in fact, molded in part by the ideals, needs and taste of the age, we could favor and heartily welcome a brief restatement of the essentially traditional doctrines of the old creeds and confessions, provided always it were carried out on the basis of definitely ascertained results in Biblical theology and contemporaneous research in all fields.

RECONSTRUCTION OF REFORMED CHURCH DOCTRINE.

The Reformed Church in the United States accepts the Heidelberg Catechism as exhibiting the system of truth and doctrine revealed in Scripture. The space at our disposal being too limited for a full discussion of the subject of a reconstruction of the doctrinal system of the Catechism, we must content ourselves with a few general observations and reserve possibly for another occasion the consideration of special and necessarily involved questions. We may profit in this connection by the words of Dr. Charles A. Briggs shortly before his death: "I challenge any man, to produce any valid results of modern philosophy or modern science that will in the slightest degree impair the Christ of the church as represented by her creeds and institutions."

This bold challenge in defence of "the Christ of the Church" and "her creeds," is issued by one entirely competent to express a mature judgment and outweighs the vagaries of a whole ten-acre field of men who dipping a little into science and philosophy and failing to think through the profound truths formulated in the historic creeds, have in their own eyes passed far beyond St. Paul, St. John, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Ursinus, and so begin to "reconstruct" the doctrines of God, Man, sin and redemption. Such reconstructive efforts share the usual fate of fads and isms: they have their brief day and are then consigned to the museum of theological curiosities. Twenty years after an attempt at

theological reconstruction, the celebrated Dr. Horace Bushnell admitted his failure, humbly saying: "I had not sufficiently considered the difficulty of the problem."

The issue between the Heidelberg Catechism and any reconstructive scheme is fundamentally the issue between the old and the new world-view or philosophy (for in these days, philosophy, not theology, is said to be the queen of the sciences). A man who accepts the new world-view is logically driven to reject the system of doctrine unfolded in the Catechism; a man who rejects the new world-view with its half-digested and contradictory postulates will on the other hand be disposed to regard the theological system underlying the Catechism as essentially correct, though admitting here and there of emphasis on certain points helpful to the present age. Since the new world-view is in process of formation and has thus far assumed an individualistic rather than a generic character, any attempted reconstruction of the Catechism or of Reformed Church doctrine must exhibit a similar individualistic character. As soon as men undertake to substitute a fundamentally new theory for the Catechism's presentation of the nature of God, the person of Christ, man's sinfulness and deliverance, the atonement, faith, the sacraments and the chief *loci*, they must take a definite stand on the great problems of modern thought, either on the side of a thorough-going Christian theism or on that of the current naturalistic (scientific) monism. There is no middle position. The reconstructionist is on the open sea, with no harbor in sight, and with a poor compass.

Any construction or reconstruction of Reformed doctrine must proceed along one of three lines. We may work out from nature and its laws and so have a closed and iron-clad system of nature, to which God and man are subordinated. Or we may start with man and his wonderful achievements and then we get Humanism, pragmatism, Pelagianism, Socinianism and the whole brood of systems coming under the head of theological rationalism. Or, we may start with the

God of Scripture (as revealed in Christ) and then we can construct theology in the true sense. The new theology is theology without the *theos*.

The writer has not been permitted to see any considerable number of attempted reconstructions of the Catechism. [The reference here is not to the numerous adaptations, rearrangements and simplifications of the Catechism, reflecting the traditional system of doctrine and generally serving a useful purpose, but to an entirely new reconstruction of the system of theology.] The usual formula for compounding the thoroughly new and reconstructed Catechism runs as follows: Take equal parts of Arianism, semi-Arianism, Pelagianism, semi-Pelagianism, pantheism, naturalism, evolutionism, energetic monism, Humanism, pragmatism, functional psychology and Unitarianism; mix thoroughly, add about a ton of what the English call *cock-sureness*, and administer in doses to suit the mental and spiritual condition of the patient. In short, as matters now stand, any radical reconstruction of the Heidelberg Catechism or of Reformed Church doctrine would probably be a *rudis indigestaque moles*.

DEDUCTIONS.

Several conclusions follow:—

First. Since each constructive period of the Church, as the Nicene, and the sixteenth century Reformation, formulated its conception of the essentials of Christianity, as the result of more profound study of Scripture and of the special demands of the age, the legitimacy of a reformulation or even of a reconstruction of Christian and, specifically of Reformed doctrine is assumed in principle.

Second. Recognizing that the old creeds and catechisms are assailed in the name of the new Biblical criticism, the physical and philosophical sciences, and contemporaneous thought generally, and that dissatisfaction with the traditional teaching of the Church is more or less widespread, we incline to the view that the Reformed Church must sooner or later face

the alternative, either of requiring an adherence to the time-honored doctrines embraced in the so-called Apostolic and Nicene Creeds and the Heidelberg Catechism as an indispensable requisite of all who minister at her altars, or of allowing these old standards to remain as monuments of the past and proceeding to reconstruct her creedal position along the lines demanded by contemporary science and philosophy.

Third. Recognizing, however, in the language of Shailer Mathews that "scientists themselves cannot tell us with unanimity just what results theology should use" and in that of Dr. Briggs that thus far, reconstructive efforts have been nothing but "an eclectic, syncretistic theology out of a comparative study of all religions, and in the form of recent undigested philosophical speculations," we are convinced that conditions are at present unfavorable for a radical reconstruction of the Christian and specifically Reformed system of doctrine and that until some twentieth century Calvin or Ursinus arises to give us a more Biblical, scientific, philosophical and Christological system, the Reformed Church cannot afford to abandon definitely ascertained truth for untried and ephemeral hypotheses or to manifest too great zeal in removing the old landmarks.

Fourth. Comparing the doctrinal system of the Catechism to a grand old palace, we hold that some modern improvements may indeed be installed, as a new heating apparatus, telephone, electric light, new rugs, new wall decorations, some new verandas and porches, here and there a new window, a new Carnegie organ and possibly a tower at one of the corners; but the foundation and the massive stone walls, the general outline of the structure, the spacious corridors and apartments, the classic architecture, the majestic symmetry of the structure cannot well be improved.

In short, as Dr. Lang of the University of Halle said on May 13, 1914, at the General Synod in Lancaster, Pa.: "we cannot renounce the doctrinal system of the Heidelberg Catechism without renouncing ourselves."

IX.

THE NECESSITY OF THEOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

In the Report of the Deputation of non-Episcopal ministers, appointed by the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on a World Conference on Faith and Order to visit the communions, other than the Anglican, of Great Britain and Ireland in the interest of the proposed conference, we find the following statement:

“We first met at the Whitefield Tabernacle a large group of representatives of the Swanick Free Church Fellowship. This organization has in its membership about three hundred young ministers of the non-Anglican Churches who have bound themselves together ‘prayerfully ‘in the light of all new knowledge and scientific method to reëxamine and, if need be, to reëxpress for our time the fundamental affirmations of the faith,’ desiring ‘to cultivate a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.’ ”

These three hundred young ministers have taken a definite stand toward the problem of theological reconstruction. They make room for “all new knowledge” and for the “scientific method.” In the light of this knowledge and method, they purpose to “reëxamine” and, if the results of their investigation make it necessary, to “reëxpress for our own time the fundamental affirmations of the faith.” The motive of their inquiry is not to engage in vain speculations, but “to cultivate a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.” Thus they recognize in their platform the right and the duty “to reëxamine and, if need be, to reëxpress for our own time the fundamental affir-

mations of the faith." They, also, discern the close relation between the cultivation of a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church on the one hand, and the reëxamination and reëxpression for our own time of the fundamental affirmations of the faith on the other.

This attitude of the non-Conformist ministers of England is taken also by many bishops, teachers, and priests of the Established Church. Toward the end of last year a notable book, entitled "Foundations," was published by seven Oxford men as a contribution towards the reconciliation of religious belief with modern thought. "The chief value of the book," says the Bishop of Zanzibar, who is by no means in sympathy with its contents, "is not in its theology nor its philosophy, but rather in the revelation it affords of the official attitude of the Bishops implicated towards heresy and unorthodox speculations."

Even the casual observer of theological publications of the last decade will no longer be bold enough to ascribe attempts at theological reconstruction to the so-called sceptical critics and philosophers of German, Swiss, and Dutch universities, but will have to concede in all fairness that devout ministers and teachers of the churches of Great Britain and America are "prayerfully" investigating and sincerely seeking to reëxpress the fundamental affirmations of the faith. In fact modernism is confined not merely to the Roman Catholic Church, but prevails to a large extent in the Protestant churches throughout the world. A new line of cleavage is becoming visible in Christian communions of the twentieth century. Formerly it was a horizontal line which divided the Catholics on the one side from the Protestants on the other. Now it is a perpendicular line, on the one side of which are the Catholic modernists and Protestant liberals, and on the other the Catholic mediaevalists and Protestant conservatives. For it cannot be gainsaid that in their point of view and their method of investigation the liberal Protestant and the Catholic modernist are in closer harmony than the liberal and conservative Protestant on the one hand or the Catholic modernist and mediaevalist on the other.

How shall we account for a movement so wide-spread and supported by men of such unquestionable sincerity of purpose and thoroughness of scholarship? In his celebrated encyclical on "Modernism," Pope Pius X terms it "poisonous doctrines," "the destruction not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion," "a synthesis of all heresies." He refers it to proximate and remote causes. The former he describes as a "perversion of the mind"; the latter as "curiosity and pride." From the Catholic viewpoint the Pope is right. He will find numerous Protestants, who in many respects are his bitter foes, to agree with him in their judgment of the liberal movement in evangelical churches. Yet one cannot help but feel that Professor Eucken shows far deeper insight into the religious problem of the day when he says: "Only a superficial consideration of the changes in theology will attribute them merely to the unbelief and depravity of men." He finds the cause for theological changes in the undeniable fact that "the old interpretation of religion has come into conflict with an essentially changed view of the world and an altered feeling towards life." Theological reconstruction is, therefore, an historical necessity, and not merely a human vagary.

It is the feeling, vaguely felt by the laity and more clearly realized by the ministry, that the theology of the past, Catholic or Protestant, is no longer adequate to express the faith of the Church of the present. The world, which has been made known to us by modern science and enterprise, is so immense that traditional creeds are being stretched to the breaking point in the endeavor to make a pretense of covering it. This tension between the old theology and the new world constrains men to the task of theological reconstruction. Their avowed purpose is not, as some seem to think, the destruction of theology or of religion, but its reconstruction "in the light of all new knowledge and scientific method." Loisy, a representative Catholic modernist, says the aim of modernism is "to adapt Catholicism to the intellectual, moral, and social demands of today." McGiffert, a representative Protestant liberal, defines the task

of reconstruction as "an effort to reconcile religious ideas and theological thought to modern science, philosophy, and life." Whatever the result of this effort may be, it must be conceded that the purpose of these men is good. Nor are they attempting something new. For, since the gospel was proclaimed by Jesus, his followers have tried to adapt his message, though with a relative degree of success, to the thought and life of the age in which it was presented. There has been, accordingly, a diversity of theological systems—Jewish and Greek, Roman and Mediaeval, Teutonic and Modern. The inference seems legitimate that fidelity to the gospel and loyalty to the fathers require us to do for our age what Christians in the past have done for theirs.

But some one asks, is a reconstruction of theology necessary or possible at this time? Men, who are equally devout and scholarly, differ in answering this question. There are those who sincerely believe that the theology of the Church has been finally wrought out in the past, and all we need to do is to defend and perhaps amend it, and hand it down intact to succeeding generations. They are satisfied with Thomas Aquinas, if they are Catholics; with Luther, Calvin, or Arminius, if they are Protestants. They invest their confessions and catechisms with the infallibility which they ascribe to the Bible, because these symbols presumably embody the divinely revealed system of doctrine in the Sacred Scriptures. Others admit that theological reconstruction may be necessary from time to time, but they assume that we are not prepared to reconstruct now. They argue that "the modern view of the world, the new conceptions in philosophy, the new theories in science, are not yet sufficiently tested, or their bearing sufficiently understood," to make these a basis for a new theological system. This view is not to be lightly set aside; for a reconstruction that is to be anything more than an aimless and haphazard revision can be effected only under the control of some definite principle great enough and far-reaching enough to form the basis of the entire system. A premature attempt at

reconstruction might defeat its very purpose. There is, however, an increasing minority, if not majority, of Christian ministers and teachers who are convinced that "one of the most crying needs of the day is a genuine and thoroughgoing reconstruction of our traditional theology—a reconstruction that shall bring out clearly, and give the proper emphasis to, the great and underlying principles of Christianity, which have been obscured by so much temporary and unessential matter, and about which there is today so wide-spread an uncertainty and doubt." While this task cannot be performed in a day, not by a single individual nor by the acts of an ecclesiastical council, it can be accomplished only by painstaking investigation, mutual coöperation, and persistent effort.

The writer is in accord with the men who believe in the necessity of theological reconstruction at the present time. It devolves upon him, therefore, to give a reason for the faith that is in him. The limits of this paper do not permit an exhaustive discussion of all the factors and forces which make for reconstruction. Indeed all the tendencies that enter into modern civilization and culture have a more or less modifying influence on theology. I shall, therefore, enumerate only some of the more salient reasons for the present urgency of theological reconstruction.

I.

The conception of the controlling principle and of the scope of theology has changed. Catholics and Protestants have considered the function of theology to set forth in logical form the system of doctrine which God has revealed in the Bible. The system, once formulated in confessions, catechisms, and dogmatics and buttressed at every point by biblical texts, naturally shared in the permanency and the infallibility of the Scriptures. The Bible from Genesis to Revelation, without reference to the relative authority of its different books, furnished the material for theology.

The study of the history of dogma, however, has made it clear that the traditional theologies are not pure transcripts of

biblical doctrine, and are not controlled by the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Too frequently ideas of God, man, and the world, far more pagan than Christian, dominated so-called Christian theology. Nor do we now regard the Bible as primarily a compend of dogmas and precepts let down from heaven to earth, but as a record of devout men's experience of God under all the circumstances of life.

Speaking of the adjustment of the gospel to heathen philosophy in the time of Justin Martyr (A. D. 104), Professor Thomas C. Hall says: "This process meant in many ways an essential transformation of the gospel from the simplicity of the good news of Jesus to the elaborate theology, ceremonial, and political organization of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor had the great scholars of the Reformation period the tools with which an historical separation could be made between this radical innovation and the simple saving faith. Not even the evangelical revival has given us back a Christianity clearly separated from the Roman Catholic accretions."

In the theology of the Alexandrines, Clement and Origin, the eternal Logos, not the historical Jesus, was the formative principle. The system of Augustine was shaped by the idea of God as the only source of good and as absolute will. Christ's relation to the sacramental system and the treasury of merits engaged the attention of medieval theologians. The sovereign decree of God was regnant in Calvinism, and the freedom and responsibility of man in Arminianism.

One is driven to the conclusion that orthodox theology has not been true to its theory of incarnation. It accepted the principle that the incarnation is the supreme revelation of God; and then, instead of basing its conceptions of God upon Jesus, it has rather based its conceptions of Jesus upon preconceived notions of God. The result is that it has put his Divinity not in what has been revealed, but in what is hidden; not in the compelling power of His words and life, but in something that is inferred to exist behind it. The inferences may all be sound; but they are not always Christian.

In comparatively recent times has the idea been affirmed that Jesus Christ is central in all Christian living and thinking. Luther perceived, but did not consistently apply, this truth. He failed to reconstruct much of the traditional theology in the light of the Christo-centric principle and handed down to his successors a large part of that theology unchanged. They, instead of completing his work, forgot altogether his fundamental gospel, and put the Bible in the place which Luther had given to the Christ. The result was that the system of Protestant dogmatics had become ostensibly, if not in reality, biblical theologies, to the almost complete obscuring of the Christian principle.

To Schleiermacher and Ritschl we are indebted for a new conception of the scope and the distinctive principle of Christian theology. Both ruled out material that belongs legitimately only to science and philosophy; and both, though pursuing different methods and reaching different results, tried to make Jesus and his revelation central in theology. They distinguished between religious knowledge and scientific or philosophical knowledge. The former alone is appropriate material for the dogmatician. "Revelation and Faith," says Kaftan, a Ritschlian, "are inseparably connected. Truth is communicated, and creates knowledge where faith is awakened, when men are reconciled to God and are called to His Kingdom. Where this does not take place, there is no knowledge—at most, the intellectual appropriation of a sacred tradition." The revelation of Jesus, appropriated by the living faith of his followers, not the speculations of men, or even the Bible as traditionally received, is made the controlling principle of a distinctively Christian theology. This, then, is the exact nature of the revolution which Ritschl has effected in theology. Divinity he affirmed to be primarily a moral attribute. While the older theology argues that Jesus is to be obeyed in all things, because he is God, Ritschl contends that Jesus is God because he approves himself as worthy of absolute obedience.

When "Christ's life purpose"—the giving to others the

life which he lived, his freedom from fear and sin, his victory over the world through faith in God his father and through devotion to his will—furnishes the material of Christian thinking, then much in the traditional theologies that was relegated to the background and obscured by non-Christian ideas, will stand out in clearer perspective. Much, also, that was made unduly prominent, though it was largely irrelevant in these systems, will be excluded and referred to archeologist and historian, to scientist and philosopher. Theology will partake more of the simplicity of the gospel and will cast off the metaphysical abstractions which perplexed, confused, and often divided the Church.

“Going back to this central fact of Christianity,—going back to Christ’s life-purpose,—we get from it,” says one of our most distinguished American theologians, “one after another of the great truths of the Christian system. We get from it, for instance, the Christian view of God, Christ’s father and ours; a God of love, whose purpose of love for his children is realized in Christ’s life of service; a God who is ever giving himself for his children, even as Christ gave himself for his brethren. We get, also, the Christian view of the world: that it belongs to God, who is working in and through it to establish his kingdom, and that for the child of God it is a field for service, for conflict, and for victory. We get also the Christian view of men: children of God and brethren of one another, whose true life is not meat and drink, health and wealth, but to do the will of God their father in the service of their brethren. We get also the Christian view of salvation: victory over the world and sin and death, and the conscious fulfilling of the purpose of God. And we get, also, the Christian view of Christ: the one who has given us his faith in God his father and so has brought God to us and given us the victory over the world and sin and death which was his.”

All this the Christ ideal gives us and much more. But much that has bulked large in the traditional theologies will not find place in the new system. The revelation of Jesus “has nothing

to do with the creation of the world, the origin of man, the historicity of Adam, the fall, the flood, Jonah, the nature and attributes of the Absolute." A discussion of these topics may be interesting and helpful, but they do not necessarily come within the scope of Christian theology.

Our reconstructed theology, then, will not be less but more genuinely Christian than the systems of the past. Its material will be drawn, not from science and philosophy, but from the revelation of Jesus appropriated by the community of believers. Its basal pillars will be revelation and faith. The revelation of Jesus will be normative and the Christian consciousness will be formative. The Bible, Christian history, the results of science, and the truths of philosophy, will be held in subordination to the Christian view of God, man, and the world. Such a theology will not consist of theoretical propositions which only trained logicians can understand; it will be simple, practical, preachable, and believable.

II.

Closely related to the new conception of the scope and the function of theology, is the change in the view of the nature of Christianity. Though men have always regarded it as a life, theologians and ecclesiastics have treated it as a series of doctrines and of precepts. These have been spoken unto the fathers in the prophets and at the end of these days in his Son. The doctrines are to be implicitly believed and the precepts unconditionally obeyed. Belief and obedience are the conditions of salvation. This is the soul of dogmatism and ecclesiasticism. Out of it have come many forms of bigotry and intolerance. For, when men have once discovered the divinely revealed doctrines and precepts, they have found the only way of salvation. Toleration of those, who differ from these dogmas and ordinances, would be nothing less than a betrayal of a sacred trust.

In a way as never before the theologian now makes earnest with the statement that Christianity is a life before it is a

dogma, a cultus, or a polity. It is the life of fellowship between God and man in and through Jesus Christ. It is the fellowship of faith Godward and of love manward. Through Jesus men actually become sons of God and brothers of one another. The life was begotten by Jesus in his disciples and by them it has been propagated through the centuries over the earth.

In course of time men reflected upon the objective realities and the subjective experiences of the Christ-life, and defined it in doctrinal forms. They saw God, man, and the world in a new light. They interpreted the motives and the goal of life in a new way. They related the gospel to the history of the world, and differentiated it from other religions, Jew and Gentile. They brought its ideas to bear on the great problems of philosophy—the origin, nature, and destiny of the world and of man.

The theological and ecclesiastical forms in which the Christian life was expressed naturally differed in different lands and times. The differences are due to racial characteristics, degrees of civilization and culture, the genius of the representative theologians, the religious, intellectual, political, and social heritage of a people, all of which have a molding influence on the doctrine, cultus, and polity of the churches. The forms of Christianity, therefore, vary, but the great verities of the revelation of Jesus are as fixed as the stars. Each nation and each age must interpret these eternal truths from its own point of view and in its own forms of thought and action. The theologies, which are the result of such interpretation, can have only relative value; none can have absolute authority.

“Our little systems have their day.
They have their day and cease to be,
They are but broken lights of Thee.”

The nature of Christianity conceived as life makes theological reconstruction a perennial task of the Christian Church. For the gospel becomes a vital power in an age only when it is embodied in the forms of thought and life of that age.

III.

A new conception of the Bible is involved in the changed view of the nature of Christianity. Many feel the force of Dr. Gladden's statement that "the theory of the Bible which is now held and that by a large proportion of devout and intelligent biblical scholars in all Protestant churches, is radically different from that which was taught at the beginning of my ministry." The difference is contained in the assertion that the Bible is literature, which is the corollary of the proposition that Christianity is life. For literature, sacred or profane, is the record of life.

Formerly it was assumed that the Bible was a divine oracle—God's book because he was its author using chosen men to be his amanuenses. Every sentence, therefore, was of immediate divine origin, and as "God was omniscient the Bible was inerrant." Revelation on its objective side was anti-historical and on its subjective side was anti-psychological. Professor Foster cites a legend, a naive botanical hypothesis, to illustrate this theory of revelation. The Great Spirit, having created the trees of the forest, comes in the night each spring and sticks leaves and blossoms on the branches. So, according to Augustine, the great tree of humanity, blasted by sin, grows nothing from within that is divine; revelation is external, mechanical, miraculous, and only truth so revealed has saving efficacy.

This theory of the Bible became untenable in the light of scientific discoveries and historical investigation. The thousands of variations in the numerous manuscripts of the Old and the New Testament became an un rebuttable argument, even in the layman's mind, against the inerrancy of the Scriptures. The most that could be maintained by the staunchest champions of verbal inspiration was that the original manuscripts at least were free from error. Even this inmost citadel for the verbalists gave way before the undeniable results of literary criticism; to which tests the Bible as Hebrew literature had to be subjected. Some of the biblical books, like Genesis, were clearly a composite, taken from sources written

at different times and by different men. These documents, either as a whole or in part, were "pieced together in a very artless fashion, with gaps and repetitions and displacements which are quite incompatible with omniscient superintendence." Moreover, it could not be gainsaid that certain discrepancies and contradictions appear in the biblical accounts of the same events. Deeds, whose ethics are hard to reconcile with Christian standards, and yet are said to have been done by direct command of God, are recorded on its pages. Sentiments are uttered by the saints of Israel which offend Christian ideals of justice and humanity.

Difficulties like these have to be met. Some, in their eagerness to discredit all religion, turned their backs on the Bible as a mass of antiquated traditions and untrustworthy tales. But others clung tenaciously to the earthen vessel with its heavenly treasure until they made their Bible a greater and better book than the fathers ever thought it to be. After having tested it by the most rigid literary and historical criticism, they conclude that the books of the Bible are not a forgery or a pious fraud, but for the most part a trustworthy historical record. They are not, indeed, infallible, historically, scientifically, nor ethically. But they contain a priceless treasure for mankind, "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness."

The supreme religious value of the Scriptures is in the fact that they record in a variety of literary forms, prose and poetry, history and fiction, proverb and prophecy, annals and laws, the gradual revelation of God to the Hebrew people who for unknown reasons were specially fitted to receive the divine message. How this people was led "from the dawn of their God-consciousness, through mazes of superstition and crudities of ethical development up to the noble monotheism of the prophets and out into the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ," may be clearly traced on its pages.

To use the words of Dr. Gladden in a recent article on a

“Dangerous Crusade,” “it records the phases of thought and feeling, of struggle and discipline, through which they have passed; it shows us their tentative and fumbling endeavors after the truth of life, and how by the discipline of a wise Providence they were guided step by step toward that larger knowledge of God which can never be ours until we find it for ourselves. The history of this development is of unspeakable value to the world; but it is only so when we take it for what it is, and study these biographies and these laws and these stories and songs as the expression of a people slowly rising out of the darkness of semi-barbarism into the light of a better day. When we insist on taking all these confused speculations and these crude moralizings as the very voice of God, we are simply blind followers of the blind.”

We must go a step farther. The consummate worth of the Bible lies in the fact that it records the life of Him in whom Hebrew revelation culminates and from whom Christian revelation radiates. He is forever the way, the truth, and the life. The character and teaching of Jesus Christ are the touchstone of the whole biblical literature. Whatever is in contradiction to his words and his life does not have the authority of a word of God, and must be regarded as an imperfect comprehension of the divine will.

An examination of the proof texts in confessions, catechisms, and dogmatics, Catholic and Protestant, will clearly show that the authors used the Bible as an infallible oracle, a compend of divinely revealed doctrines equally authoritative in all its parts. While the quantity of revelation in Genesis may be less than that in the gospel of John, its quality is the same. Texts for the proof of dogmas from the one are as valid as from the other. If the new conception of the Bible, which we have described, is accepted, then many of the time-worn proof texts for confessional statements and dogmatic treatises will lose their value, and the necessity of theological reconstruction is too self-evident to require further argument.

IV.

The ultimate facts with which theology has to do are God, man, and the world. When men's conception of these entities and of their interrelation changes, a corresponding change must take place in the theological systems which interpret them. That the antique view of the world and of human life has changed, men may deplore, but they cannot deny without jeopardizing their reputation for intelligence. Let us then first consider the change of world-view (*Weltanschauung*).

The traditional theologies are inseparably interwoven with the ancient view of the world, which was both geocentric and anthropomorphic. The Catholic modernists make merry over the little sixteenth century world of the Vatican. It is a mere toy compared with the universe of modern science. The earth is supposed to be the center, and the vault of heaven, studded with sun, moon, and stars, was the outermost limit. Above the firmament is the abode of the Deity and his angels, and beneath is the abyss of the devil and the damned. What happened on earth decided the fate of all creation. It is the world of Aristotle and the mediaeval theologians. The Greek philosopher said: "All men believe that there are gods, and assign the uppermost places to the Deity." The terms "high" and "low," "up" and "down," in religion originally had literal meaning. The antithesis between heaven and earth was one with the antithesis between the divine and the human, the eternal and the transitory, the perfect and the imperfect. This picture of the universe was clearly in harmony with biblical ideas. It is the background of Genesis—the story of creation, the Fall and the deluge. Heaven is God's throne, the earth is his footstool. Jesus ascended into heaven and descended into hell. Paul was "caught up even to the third heaven" and "into Paradise, where he heard unspeakable words." We read of angelic visitations and ministries from on high, of "the world-rulers of this darkness" and "the spiritual host of wickedness in heavenly places." The scheme of redemption was decreed in heaven and then executed on earth. The view of Aristotle and

of the Scriptures was taken over by ecclesiastical theologians and incorporated into theological systems which have held sway until recent times. For in their conception of the universe Luther and Calvin were not in advance of the mediaeval schoolmen. Of Copernicus Luther said: "This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy, but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and not the earth." Calvin proved to his own satisfaction "that the heavens, sun, and moon move about the earth, which stands still in the center." John Owen a Puritan divine referred to the Copernican system as a "delusive and arbitrary hypothesis contrary to Scripture." Even John Wesley two centuries after the Reformers shared in their view and regarded the new science as "tending to infidelity."

This shows how radically the discoveries of Copernicus changed men's view of the universe. The sun became the center of the solar system of which the earth was only a minor planet. Our solar system was seen to be only one of an endless wilderness of suns and planets sweeping through space and extending far beyond the reach of the wildest fancy. The sharp clear framework, within which religious ideas were localized, fell away. The firmament, the throne of God above the firmament, the flat disc of earth, the infernal regions of darkness and demons, were suddenly dissolved into thin air. There was no "up" and no "down," no supernatural superimposed on the natural, no divine being seated king-like above the human. These terms, once literally understood, had to be spiritualized if they were to continue as vehicles for the religious concepts of the modern man.

As the world of space was infinitely enlarged, so the world of time was infinitely extended. The geologist and archeologist upset the chronology of Archbishop Ussher. The conception of the nature of time itself has changed. In the old world scheme, time was a brief span between two eternities—the interim between creation and the judgment day. In the modern view eternity is not to be thought of as "before" and "after time,"

but as immanent in all time, giving it content and value. Eternity is not mere time infinitely prolonged—everlastingness. The “here” does not precede the “hereafter,” but the “hereafter” exists in, with, and under the “here.” Eternity is persistence of spiritual and ethical values amid the mutations and illusions of the temporal. Thus, as the infinite operates in all cause and pervades all space, so the eternal is immanent in all time.

The world, in this view, is more than a vale of tears which we must patiently tolerate until the day of death or of judgment. It is more than a stage of discipline and chastisement for the next world. It has in it eternal potencies and values; and secular achievements and goods are invested with a sacred meaning. The earth itself is to be transformed into the kingdom of God—an ideal which has inspired great social movements with heroic efforts to give the individual legitimate enjoyment of life, culture, and property. The old dualism between “joyless labor” here, and “laborless joy” hereafter, is superseded by the new monism of “joyous labor” here, and “laboring joy” hereafter.

The antique world-view represents the universe as static, created once for all by a divine fiat; the new, as genetic, continually becoming. Fixity yields to motion, absoluteness to relativity. The one is the Platonic, mediaeval, rationalistic universe of the static, and the other is the Hegelian, Darwinian universe of process and becoming. Evolution is taken to be God’s way of working in nature and history, and all entities, material and spiritual, are in process of realization, not in final form.

V.

The new view of the world affects profoundly the traditional view of God. If it is to be retained it must be transformed and adapted to the dimensions of the universe brought to light by telescope and microscope. The first effect of the new world-view upon the modern man was startling indeed. The authorities of the Church were guided by the instinct of self-preser-

vation when they pronounced the death sentence on Giordano Bruno in Rome. Grant his cosmology, and the mediaeval system of the Church will topple over. Nietzsche raised the alarming cry, "God is dead!" No, God is not dead. But the conception of God above the universe, ruling nature and individuals like an oriental monarch controls his realm, has, indeed, passed away. In its stead has come a God so much greater and grander than the God of old, as the new world is greater, more mysterious, and more awe-inspiring than the old view of the world. It is not a question of the old God or the new God; but of a clearer vision of the true God as his everlasting power and divinity are manifested through the things that are made.

The moral attributes of God revealed in Jesus Christ are not modified by changes of world-view. Whether we hold to the "little sixteenth century world of the Vatican," or to the vast twentieth century world of the observatory, our God is always a God of love and mercy, of righteousness and truth. His providence is coëxtensive with the universe.

"I know not where his isles may lift
Their fronded palms in air.
This I know, I cannot drift
Beyond his love and care."

The conception of the method of God's creative and revealing activity, however, must change in the light of the new world-view. With the passing of the geocentric universe goes the anthropomorphic God. The idea of local transcendence gives way to the idea of spiritual immanence. The most satisfactory analogy of God's relation to the world is the soul's relation to the body. The soul is immanent in the body, and yet transcends it. It is not identical with the body; but different from it and controls it. It transcends the body, not by dwelling locally above it, but by being spiritually and ethically different from it. In a similar way God is in the world. He is not identical with the world, nor does he dwell locally above the world. His transcendence consists in his being spiritually

and ethically different from the world in which he abides. He creates and upholds the universe, somewhat as the soul creates and upholds the body. It is questionable whether this mystery of God's relation to the world can ever be defined more clearly than by the analogy of the soul's relation to the body. Only by parables can we set forth the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

Thus the doctrines of transcendence and immanence are retained; but they are spiritualized and ethicized. Only in this way will our God-idea be great enough to coincide with our world-idea. Room is made for the universality, the immediacy, and the perpetuity of divine activity. "Not until the rise of this new conception," says Professor Foster, "could the idea of monotheism enjoy full fruition."

The view of God's way of creation changes correspondingly. He does not create by external impact upon chaotic masses, somewhat like the sculptor works on marble, the carpenter on a building, the mechanic on an engine. He creates by an immanent activity, by gradual evolution, as the soul creates the body. He does not finish creation in a specified time and then occasionally interfere with the natural order as there may be necessity for it. He creates perpetually. "My father worketh hitherto and I work." As he creates the world now, so he has always created it—by process, not by fiat. We see God at work everywhere, from clod to star, from insect to man. The whole universe is a sacrament of the Deity. The whole universe is a miracle—a sign of the wonderful presence and power of God.

This new conception of immanence is wrought into poetry by Goethe in the classic passage:

"Was wär' ein Gott, der nur von aussen stiesse,
Im Kreis das All am Finger laufen liesse!
Ihm ziemt's die Welt im innern zu bewegen,
Natur in Sich, Sich in Natur zu hegen,
So dass, was in ihm lebt und webt und ist,
Nie seine Kraft, nie seinen Geist vermisst."

The idea of revelation and inspiration is not given up, but the manner of it is differently conceived. Since the "below" and the "above" have ceased to exist in their literal sense, revelation can no more be regarded as an occasional act of God by which he miraculously makes known to a chosen people through a particular individual, in vision or dream, a part of the plan of redemption. Revelation in this view is a momentary, mechanical, and even visible transaction between God and man. Upon it rests the theory of biblical infallibility.

Accepting the idea of divine immanence, God must be regarded as working in all men. Religion, which is conceded to be as universal as the race, is an evidence of the perpetual mystical contact between God and men. God seeks to express himself and to realize himself in the tribes and nations of the earth through receptive individuals—prophets since the world began. His efforts are often hindered and thwarted by the indifference and the callousness of human nature. Some nations are more receptive than others; the nation which has the largest receptivity will receive the highest revelation. This revelation is embodied in the forms of religion—doctrine, worship, morality. The literature of the nations contains the revelation of God. There are almost as many Bibles as there are nations. The Sacred Books of the east cover many shelves in a modern library. Yet they have relative value. We find the clearest, the most satisfying, revelation in the Hebrew Bible; and the crown of all revelation in Jesus Christ. In Him the law and the prophets of the ages and the nations are fulfilled. In Him we behold the fulness of the God-head bodily. The Bible of the Christian will always remain the authoritative record of divine revelation—God's book because it is man's book. It shows us how faith has brought men out of darkness into light and how God, in whom they have trusted, has saved and sanctified them. These views of the world and of God, of creation, providence, and revelation, which were as strange to Luther and Calvin as to Thomas Aquinas, must be incorporated in a theology which presumes to interpret the God of contemporary Christianity.

VI.

In the wake of a new world-view and a new God-idea, comes a new conception of man and of human life. Men rediscovered humanity in the Renaissance and the Reformation.

Man, as the Church described him, was depraved and helpless, without capacity for truth and without ability for virtue. He was kept in tutelage by the Church through whose mediation his mind was enlightened and his will was trained. For grace and truth he had to rely upon sources and agencies above and beyond himself. His life was heteronomous, *i. e.*, determined for him by processes other than his own. The principle of authority, which is essential to Catholicism, suppressed free investigation and moral initiative. Neither in nature nor in the realm of the spirit was the individual given free play. "The dogmatist," says Höffding, "ever held watch over the mystic and the ecclesiastic held in check the scientist." While the one was seeking to explore the realm of the spirit, the other the realm of nature, both were curbed by the authority of the Church.

The world itself, from early Christian times, was regarded as evil and irredeemable, the embodiment of satanic power which is the direct opposite of the kingdom of God. The civic life of the Roman empire was interwoven by countless threads with pagan faith and cultus, which Christians could consider only as superstitious and demonic idolatry. From such a world they stood aloof. In addition to the depravity of the world the Christian believed in the imminent return of Christ and the establishment of a kingdom upon the ruins of the old social and religious order. These convictions exercised a powerful influence on the moral disposition of the individual.

The ideal of life resolved itself into a renunciation of the present evil world for a coming world of righteousness and glory. Flight from nature's demonic charms into cloistral gloom, the castigation of the body, contempt of the beautiful, zealous care for the salvation of the soul, absorption in contemplation and asceticism were the characteristics of sainthood. The will to live was held in check.

Both the Renaissance and the Reformation proclaimed a new ideal of life. The humanists, in contact with Greek and Latin classics, discovered a human ideal far different from that which was taught by the theologians. They found a humanity beyond the pale of the Church, with inherent laws and powers of its own, confident that it was capable, in and of itself, to find truth and to direct life. They beheld a world that throbbed with the life, and was radiant with the beauty, of God. In such a world it was a "joy to live." The antique man in a decadent age had lost hope and courage; he sought deliverance by entrance into the celestial realm. The modern man felt the pulsations of a new spirit. The cry was now for action, not contemplation, for courage to do and to dare, not for cloistral humility and seclusion. The rejection of the world was superseded by an irrepressible desire to grapple with it and to subdue it.

The Reformers, no less than the Humanists, returned to the classics—the classics of Jew and Christian. They chose the simplicity of primitive Christianity in preference to the complexity of mediæval dogmatism and ecclesiasticism. They insisted on the authority of personal experience in religion, and announced the freedom of the Christian man. They stood for the sacredness of the secular order, the home and the state. They asserted the divineness of the human and the humanness of the divine. The doctrine of justification by grace through faith became the counterpart of the scientific method in the study of nature; and the doctrine of the universal priesthood of the believer logically led to the universal kingship of the citizen.

The human ideal of the Renaissance and the Reformation did not receive proper recognition in the theologies of that period. It was held in check by the rise of a new dogmatism and ecclesiasticism in Protestant churches. The religion of the spirit was turned again into a religion of authority. The intensity of zeal for personal salvation left small room for social redemption. The world, itself, was not considered an object of redemption. The world-weariness and pessimism of an

earlier age settled upon the evangelical churches, and eclipsed many of the promising ideals of their founders.

Not until the eighteenth century was an attempt made to incorporate the vision of the Reformer and the Humanist into the social and religious forms of life. The dogmatic spirit yielded to the scientific, monarchy to democracy, religions of authority to the religion of the Spirit, the salvation of the individual to the salvation of society.

This involves a fundamental and subtle change of mood, differing essentially from that which prevailed when the older theologies were wrought out. The change is as difficult to define as it is clearly felt, and will have to find expression in the theology and philosophy which pretend to interpret the ultimate facts and relations of life today.

VII.

We shall have to recognize, also, a change of view of the person of Christ. Not less is made of his divine nature than before; but the relation between the human and the divine in Jesus is differently conceived and expressed. This modification is a necessary consequence of the changes which we have already enumerated.

In view of the immanence of God, the contrast between the divine and the human is not drawn as sharply now as formerly. The natural and the spiritual are not conceived as irreconcilably antithetic. The finite and the infinite, the temporal and the eternal, the divine and the human, not merely exist side by side, "without confusion, change, division, separation" (Chalcedonian Creed), but they blend with each other. Moreover, the older theologians thought of reality in abstract terms. Human nature in its generic form was more real to them than any particular man. In the incarnation God, accordingly, was supposed to have assumed human nature as a whole rather than to have become a specific historical person. "To picture him as incarnate in a single individual," says Professor William Adams Brown, "passed their imagination. Even as it was,

the contrast between creator and creature was so great that it could never be wholly transcended. In the person of Christ, as elsewhere in the universe, the finite and the infinite might touch, but they could not blend. Between God and man there stretched a gulf which even incarnation could not span."

A striking illustration of the shifting of emphasis from the divine to the human aspects of Jesus' life is furnished by a criticism of a book entitled *The Corner Stone*, written by Jacob Abbott before 1850. In his *Reminiscences* in the *Outlook*, July 25, 1914, Lyman Abbott cites extracts from a review of his father's book by John Henry Newman, the leader of the High Church party in England and afterwards Cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church. The reader will observe the tendency in Abbott's description of Jesus to set forth the human and the historical side of his life. At every point he is vigorously opposed by Newman who represents traditional dogmatics with its one-sided emphasis of the Deity of Jesus.

Since Professor Abbott did not presume to write as a theologian, for he was not a professor of theology but a teacher in an academy, and yet evidently had keen insight into the gospel narratives, his views, published at so early a stage in the liberal movement in America, have no small historical value. I shall, therefore, cite the extracts from Newman's criticism at some length.

Abbott says: "Jesus Christ was in some respects the most bold, energetic, decided, and courageous man that ever lived; but in others he was the most flexible, submissive, and yielding."

Newman replies: "The Son of God made flesh, though a man, is beyond comparison with other men; His person is not human; but to say 'most of all men' is to compare."

Abbott.—"There is something very bold and energetic in the measures he adopted in accomplishing his work. . . . In fact, there perhaps was never so great a moral effect produced in three years, on any community so extensive, if we consider at all the disadvantages incident to the customs of those days.

There was no press, no modes of extensive written communication, no regularly organized channels of intercourse whatever between the different portions of the community. He acted under disadvantage."

Newman.—"Under no disadvantage, if He were God. But this is only part of one great error under which this writer lies. 'There was no press.' What notions does this imply concerning the nature, the strength, and the propagation of moral truth."

Abbott.—"He sought solitude, he shrunk from observation: in fact, almost the only enjoyment which he seemed really to love was his lonely ramble at midnight, for rest and prayer. . . . It is not surprising that, after the heated crowds and exhausting labors of the day, he should love to retire to silence and seclusion, to enjoy the cool and balmy air, the refreshing stillness, and all the beauties and glories of midnight among the solitudes of the Galilean hills, to find there happy communion with his Father."

Newman.—"The more ordinary and commonplace, the more like vulgar life, the more carnal the history of the Eternal Son of God is made, the more does this writer exult in it. He exults in sinking the higher notion of Christ, and making the flesh the hegemonic of a Divine Essence."

Abbott.—"We learn in the same manner how distinct were the impressions of beauty or sublimity which the work of nature made upon the Savior, by the manner in which he alluded to them. . . . Look at the lilies of the field, says he. . . . A cold, heartless man without taste or sensibility, would not have said such a thing as that. He could not; and we may be as sure that Jesus Christ stopped to examine and admire the grace and beauty of the plant. . . . Now Jesus noticed these things. He perceived their beauty and enjoyed it."

Newman.—"Surely such passages as these are simply inconsistent with faith in the Son of God. Does any one feel curiosity or wonder, does any one reach and examine, in the case of things fully known to him? Could the Creator of

nature 'stop to examine' and 'enjoy the grace and beauty' of His own work?"

Even the most conservative theologian today would not be offended by Abbott's description of Jesus; much less would he concur with the criticism of Newman. Yet the point of view and method of approach of the two men are wholly different—a difference which separates the old Christology from the new. Abbott writes as an historian, Newman as a dogmatician. Abbott approaches the deity of Jesus through his humanity, Newman makes the humanity of Jesus fit a preconceived dogmatic notion of his deity. Abbott pictures Jesus as "a human individual, a child of his race and his time, only to be understood in the light of his own environment and of the antecedents, physical and spiritual from which he came." Newman makes the humanity of Jesus only "a mask which he wears, a garment he has put on to cloak the immanent deity. The divine Christ who hides behind the human Jesus and to whom alone our worship is due, shares none of these experiences. He does not suffer or pray, he shares no limitations of knowledge or power."

The method of proving the deity of Jesus has, likewise, changed. Once the criteria of a man of God, as well as of the Son of God, were the power to work miracles and the fulfillment of predictions made by him or about him. The miraculous, not the ethical, was the evidence of the divine. Now the test of deity, in prophet or in Christ, is the character of his life and the quality of his message—not the miracles he did nor the predictions he made. The triumphal cry in Gethsemane, "not my will, but thine, be done," is a more convincing proof of his deity than the "darkness which came over the whole land," and the failing of the Sun's light and the rending of the veil of the temple, immediately before he died on the cross. The prayer for those who crucified him, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do," is, to say the least, as strong evidence of his deity as the turning of water into wine.

To believe in the deity of Jesus does not mean merely to assent to the doctrine of the Virgin birth, the physical resurrection, or the inerrancy of the Bible. It means that we have personally felt his saving power, that he has delivered us from our own lusts, from the allurements of the world, from all evil,—that he is our Savior. It means that he has given us a new motive and a new goal in life, that we live no longer unto the flesh but unto the spirit, that we live soberly, righteously, godly, and hopefully,—that he is our Master. It means that in him we behold the Father, that God is eternally Christ-like and that Christ is essentially God-like,—He is our Lord whom we worship. When we trust him, obey him, worship him, we confess our faith in his deity.

On this point Professor Brown says in substance. The older apologists attempted a proof of Christ's deity which should have the force of mathematical demonstration. They approached this problem as a problem of logic in which the important thing was to put the argument in such a form that the conclusion followed irresistibly from the premises. God is a being who possesses certain qualities. Christ has these qualities. Therefore he is God.

Today proof is not so simple. Proof of Christ's deity cannot be independent of personal religious experience. We are to prove, not simply that centuries ago God was incarnate in Christ, but that Christ in what we know of him today represents what God is everywhere and always, and therefore remains forever the revelation of God.

What kind of proof then must it be which shall convince all men of the Deity of Jesus Christ? Clearly it can only be an all-embracing experience. When Christ has really shown himself master of the world, when his ideals have proved themselves the conquering ideals, when humanity as a whole has owned his sway and is conformed to his character, when all men see God in him with the clearness and the certainty as is now the case with those who are consciously his disciples, then, and not until then, will our proof of his deity be finished and the apologist's work be done.

To summarize, in conclusion, we believe in the necessity of theological reconstruction, in the Reformed, in the Lutheran, and in the Catholic Church, because of fundamental changes of view (1) of the controlling principle and the scope of theology; (2) of the nature of Christianity; (3) of the character of the Bible; (4) of the view of the world; (5) of the conception of God; (6) of the view of man and of human life; (7) of the person and work of Christ. These changes are sufficiently clear to enable us to differentiate the modern from the traditional view of these points. They not only warrant but require theological reconstruction. The churches cannot be true to their Lord, if they ignore or evade this task. The modern man, trained as he is from kindergarten to university, requires a theology that will conform to the science and philosophy which mold his thinking from infancy to age. The gospel can become effective in contemporary life only when it is cast in the intellectual and moral forms of the age. The two great movements of Christianity today—missions and church union—will be greatly advanced by theological reconstruction. To repeat the words of the platform of the Swanick Free Church Fellowship, we are convinced that the “reëxpression for our time of the fundamental affirmations of the faith in the light of all new knowledge and scientific method,” “will cultivate a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church”; yea, it will enable us to proclaim a gospel to the pagan world in the simplicity of Christ, without encumbrance of much that is non-essential, if not non-Christian, in the traditional dogmas of the Church.

LANCASTER, PA.

THE
Reformed Church
Review.

MANAGING EDITORS:

THEO. F. HERMAN, D.D.

JOHN S. STAHR, LL.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

FREDERICK A. GAST, D.D.

RICHARD C. SCHIEDT, Ph.D.

JOHN C. BOWMAN, D.D.

C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, D.D.

ANSELM V. HIESTER, A.M.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

H. M. J. KLEIN, Ph.D.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE

VOLUME XVIII.

JANUARY, 1914

PUBLISHED BY

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
AT LANCASTER, PA.

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR TO BE PAID IN ADVANCE

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER

ARTICLE	I.—The Place of Christianity in Modern Japan	I
	J. F. STEINER	
“	II.—The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel	23
	J. M. MULLAN	
“	III.—General Synod's Year of Jubilee	36
	J. I. SWANDER	
“	IV.—Inaugural Address	51
	GEORGE LESLIE OMWAKE	
“	V.—Address at the Inauguration of President Omwake	57
	J. G. HIBBEN	
“	VI.—Beneficiary Education in the Reformed Church. II	63
	CLAYTON H. RANCK	
“	VII.—A New Epoch	76
	BERNARD C. STEINER	
“	VIII.—The Church's Work in the World	86
	HENRY GEKELER	
“	IX.—Uniformity of Public Worship	93
	WILLIAM H. ERB	
“	X.—The Rationale of Temperance	99
	C. ERNEST WAGNER	
“	XI.—Contemporary Sociology	107
	A. V. HIESTER	
“	XII.—Notices of New Books	123
	<i>Szymanowski</i> : The Evolution of a Theologian ; <i>Whiton</i> : Get- ting Together ; <i>Royce</i> : The Problem of Christianity ; <i>Reaser</i> : Melchizedek ; <i>Haves</i> : The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written ; <i>Smyth</i> : Constructive Natural Theology ; <i>Appel</i> : My Own Story ; <i>Kuhns</i> : A One-sided Autobiography ; <i>Cole</i> : Wheel- Chair Philosophy ; <i>McLeod</i> : Letters to Edward,	

PROSPECTUS

— OF THE —

Reformed Church Review.

The REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW is the lineal successor of the REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW, as that was of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW. And, true to its antecedents, it will continue to be an organ for Christological, historical and positive theology, as this has come to be generally understood in the Reformed Church in the United States. Taking its position in the confessional system of the Heidelberg Catechism, it will endeavor to be true to the historical genius of the Reformed Church; but believing in the principle of historical development, it will not shut itself up to the horizon of any particular place or time in theology, but will have an open vision and a cordial welcome for all truth, new as well as old, from whatever quarter it may come.

The REVIEW will strive to be truly catholic and liberal in spirit. It proposes to serve the cause of pure truth and of pure religion. It will, therefore, not be bound by any party lines. But seeking to serve and promote the truth as it is in Christ, it will endeavor to keep itself free from all forms of theological bondage. Freedom of thought within the limits of Christian truth will ever be its watchword. Hence it retains the old motto, only in a more complete form: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

But while the REVIEW will serve chiefly as an organ for the advancement of theological learning, it will by no means exclude from its pages articles on other and more general subjects. It recognizes the truth that to Christianity, and, therefore, also to theology, nothing that is human is foreign. Natural science, philosophy, literature, ethics, sociology and kindred branches of knowledge, are at present engaging wide and earnest attention; and articles along these lines, written in the spirit of this REVIEW, are, accordingly, invited for its pages.

Finally, the REVIEW proposes to meet, as far as possible, the practical demands of the times. This is an eminently practical age. It has not much patience with mere speculation of any kind. What is wanted now is practical activity, applying the principles of Christianity to the daily affairs of life, and making the world better and happier. This tendency of the times the REVIEW believes not to be contrary to the mind of the Master; and it will, therefore, seek to furnish a due proportion of articles on practical subjects along the line of applied Christianity and Church work.

The REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW is edited under the supervision of an Editorial Board composed of members of the Faculties of the Theological Seminary and Franklin and Marshall College. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 144 pages.

 The Editors will not be responsible for the views of individual writers.

TERMS:

TWO DOLLARS per year; payable in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends the names of four new subscribers, accompanied with \$8.00.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to the

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.,

or 15th and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—All Exchanges of the REVIEW, letters relating to the Editorial Department, Manuscripts of articles intended for publication and books for notice in the REVIEW must be sent to Theo. F. Herman, D.D., College Campus, Lancaster, Pa.

